

Application Number: 24/10078 Full Planning Permission
Site: THE GRANARY, 4 HARBRIDGE COURT, SOMERLEY,
ELLINGHAM, HARBRIDGE & IBSLEY BH24 3QG
Development: Extension of living accommodation to replace x2no. bays of
existing car port; rooflights and fenestration alterations
Applicant: Mr Rickwood
Agent: STUDIO BAD
Target Date: 28/03/2024
Case Officer: Kate Cattermole
Officer Recommendation: Refuse
**Reason for Referral
to Committee:** Contrary Parish Council view
Cllr Haywood request

1 SUMMARY OF THE MAIN ISSUES

The key issues are:

- 1) Impact on the character and appearance of the curtilage listed building
- 2) Ecology

2 SITE DESCRIPTION

Harbridge Court is an isolated group of properties accessed by a gravel track and there is forest to the north of the site. It is located within the countryside.

The application site consists of a two storey building with brick single storey side addition, which was converted into a residential dwelling c 1999. The main accommodation is at first floor level over existing open car ports. At ground floor level is a kitchen and lobby, and also an enclosed store to the other side of the three open car ports. The building is faced with brickwork to the ground floor and west and east gables with horizontal black stained timber cladding at first floor level on the north and south elevations.

The existing dwelling is sited on the edge of a group of properties forming Harbridge Court and to the south of the property are Grade II Listed Buildings. The granary and cart shed now No 4, is a curtilage listed building and is primarily of significance as being a well-preserved example of a common late-18th century granary and cart shed. What sets it apart from such common examples is that it forms part of a model farm designed by architect Samuel Wyatt, who also designed Somerley House and he is recognized as an important architect of his time (The Wyatts, Architects of the Age of Enlightenment - Published by West Midlands History). The granary and cart shed forms part of a historic farmstead which is arranged around a central farmyard. The former farmhouse is located to the east of the farmyard, the barn to the west of the yard and the granary and cart shed is located to the north of the farmyard. The property is located on the northern edge of Harbridge Court fronting a gravel track and backing onto a parking court, with a modest garden area to the east of the dwelling.

3 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposal is for planning permission for external alterations to the existing dwelling to extend the living accommodation. This application is running concurrently with an associated Listed Building application 24/10079. Planning permission is required for the proposed development, as permitted development rights in respect of Classes A - H of the General Permitted Development Order Part 1 Schedule 2 were removed under the planning permission 97/62980 to convert the Granary into a residential dwelling.

External alterations comprise the following:

- Infilling of two existing open cart bays to create a ground floor living/dining room with glazed infills to the front elevation and timber infill to the side to separate the converted space from the retained single open cart bay.
- Replacement of existing first floor single glazed timber windows with double glazed units, like for like
- New first floor timber window to south elevation
- Rooflights and change of window to French doors in the single storey side extension on the east elevation
- Flue on south elevation
- Renewing brick unfilled first floor opening to west elevation

Amended plans were received on the 24 May 2024 the amendments were as follows: Juliet balconies removed from first floor windows on south elevation, two ground floor windows from south elevation removed, timber windows rather than aluminium, the end post in the cart bay now embedded in glazing to allow its significance to be revealed and new doorway into converted cart bay from lobby reduced in size.

Further amended plans were received on 20 November 2024 mainly to address mitigation measures as per the bat report: 800mm solid partition incorporated within the glazing to the front of the cart bay, solid timber panel to each side of the existing end post (this replaces the previously amended glazing to 'reveal' the end post), and a false ceiling in the cart bay. The plans have been annotated to clearly identify proposed internal works, and additional section plans have been provided for further clarity.

4 PLANNING HISTORY

Proposal	Decision Date	Decision Description	Status
24/10079 Extension of living accommodation to replace x2no. bays of existing car port; rooflights and fenestration alterations; internal alterations (Application for listed building consent)		Current	
07/90257 Flue	24/07/2007	Granted Subject to Conditions	Decided
07/89711 Flue (Application for Listed Building Consent)	01/05/2007	Granted Subject to Conditions	Decided
NFDC/97/62980 Alterations and extension to house & buildings to form 8 units & 2 new dwellings.	10/05/1999	Granted Subject to Conditions	Decided
NFDC/97/62981/LBC Alterations and extension to house & buildings to form 8 units & 2 new dwellings.	10/05/1999	Granted Subject to Conditions	Decided

89/NFDC/43684/LBC Erect hotel annexe, cou granary/stables, dem redundant bldgs	31/01/1990	Granted Subject to Conditions	Decided
89/NFDC/43685 Erect hotel annexe, cou granary/stables, dem redundant bldgs	31/01/1990	Granted Subject to Conditions	Decided

5 PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE

Local Plan 2016-2036 Part 1: Planning Strategy

Policy ENV3: Design quality and local distinctiveness

Policy ENV4: Landscape character and quality

Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management 2014

DM1: Heritage and Conservation

DM2: Nature conservation, biodiversity and geodiversity

DM20: Residential development in the countryside

National Planning Policy Framework

National Planning Policy Guidance

Plan Policy Designations

Countryside

6 PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS

Ellingham, Harbridge & Ibsley Parish Council

The Parish Council considered this application three times, the latest comment is to support the application, however the two previous comments have been included for information

Comment dated 10 October 2024:

Par 3 (Permission) for the reasons listed

Cllrs were broadly in favour of the building being updated but are aware that there are significant differences of opinion between NFDC and the parties representing this application. Cllrs concluded that this application needs to be reviewed at committee. Should the application be granted Cllrs would like the following conditions considered:

European Protected Species Mitigation licence application must be undertaken with appropriate measures conditioned to protect the bats during any building phase.

Suitable light attenuation plan submitted to NFDC.

Recommendation that no additional garage space to be created.

Comment dated 12 July 2024:

Return no determination.

The following comments to be submitted:

Cllrs received a briefing about the proposed works from the architect and applicants. Cllrs noted significant differences between NFDC's Conservation Officer's report on the historical structural and architectural elements of the building and the Heritage Report submitted by the applicant.

It was concluded that an agreed position on this matter between the parties needed to be reached before a determination by the Parish Council could be reached. Cllrs would like clarification of the following:

The fabric of the building

There appears to be a significant difference of opinion between the Conservation Officer's report and the Heritage Report commissioned by the application regarding the historical significance of several elements of the building, which needs to be addressed.

Bat Survey

The second phase of the bat survey and subsequent reports are still outstanding. This information is necessary to aid Cllrs in determining what ecological conditions might be requested should permission be granted.

The applicant / architect claimed that NFDC officers had been unwilling to hold discussions and negotiation about the proposals. Cllrs were disappointed to learn of this. Cllr Haywood offered to investigate the matter with NFDC's Development Control department.

Cllrs would be happy to look at the application again once the outstanding issues are resolved.

Comment dated 14 May 2024

PAR 4 (Refusal) for the reasons listed:

Opinion was mixed regarding the infill of the carports with glazing, however all Cllrs felt there were a number of areas that needed further information. Once the Parish Council (PC) receives this it would be happy to look at the application again

The PC would like further information on the following:

1. The original form of the Granary prior to the 1990's conversion;
2. The observation report submitted by Valerie Sharpe (8 March) noted significant use of the Granary by at least one bat species. The PC would like to see the outcome of a comprehensive survey to confirm or otherwise this observation, and how and where bats may be using the building

7 COUNCILLOR COMMENTS

No comments received

8 CONSULTEE COMMENTS

Comments have been received from the following consultees:

HCC Rights of Way

No objection subject to conditions. Reference is made to Ellingham Harbridge & Ibsley Bridleway(BW) 42 which runs along a track adjacent to the northern boundary of the site and Ellingham Harbridge & Ibsley Footpath(FP) 30 runs along a track adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site .Assumed private access rights exist along BW42 and FP30, any damage to the surface of the highway network is not liability of HCC to repair and access to the Public Rights of Way (PROW) must remain open. If a temporary closure is required an application needs to be made to HCC giving 8 weeks notice.

NFDC Ecologist is now satisfied following submission of amended plans that the works will be undertaken in a way to retain the bat roosts in situ while mitigating for potential disturbance impacts.

Conservation

Objection

The comments made on the concurrent Listed Building application are also relevant to the considerations of the planning application.

9 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

The following is a summary of the representations received.

For: 3

Against: 0

For:

- improve the property which has been neglected for many years
- needs to be brought up to be more energy efficient
- enclosure of the cart bays with glazing would retain the granary nature of the building, similar examples viewed in South Downs National Park
- the small windows on the south should allow sufficient light without altering the character of the granary
- concerns that the works would disturb dog walkers unfounded, no public parking at Harbridge Court so not many dog walkers here
- Harbridge Court community predominately pension plus age, with few younger people. Occupants of the Granary, younger and good neighbours who can be depended on in an emergency. Development would allow them to create a family home

Comment only:

- Information provided in relation to a bat survey dating from 2021, 230 pipistrelle bats counted in 20 minutes

10 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

10.1 Planning background of the site

In 1990 planning permission was granted for the Granary to be converted into offices, as part of a proposed hotel development for the site. This consent was part implemented, but not completed. At this stage the Granary was described as 'a two storey building part brick/part shiplap open bays and two garage areas access roadside. First floor high level shuttered windows (5) and hay door facing farm yard. Slate roof.' (Planning Officer site visit notes dated 18/12/89 - planning application 43684)

By 1997 it appears that the site was under new ownership and the buildings were falling into disrepair. Applications were submitted to convert the buildings into residential units of accommodation, and the full and sympathetic restoration of the buildings and encouraging a long term viable use was identified as the next preferred stage. During the process of these applications to convert the buildings into residential units to ensure their long term retention (62980-1), an emphasis was placed on retaining the character of the ancillary buildings which was considered essential both in terms of their individual value and the setting of the listed buildings.

Permission was granted for the conversion of this group of buildings to residential use in 1999, and the Granary was converted into a single unit of residential accommodation, with only the replacement of the existing lean to with a slightly larger one. Fenestration changes and internal subdivisions at first floor level were also required. However during the conversion process, the retention of the open bays at ground floor level was stated as being essential (Conservation officer Paula Freeland comments dated 1997 in respect of future proposals at Nea Farm - planning application 43685), and to ensure control over any future proposed works to the building, permitted development rights were withdrawn. As already acknowledged this building is an integral part of the historic and agricultural significance of this group of buildings, and the retention of the cart bays was considered intrinsic to the character of the building.

The Granary, 4 Harbridge Court was first sold as a residential dwelling in 2000, and there is no suggestion that it has not fulfilled its use successfully as a residential dwelling, albeit offering limited accommodation compared to the other converted dwellings on site. It is currently a well maintained 2 bedroom property, and there is no suggestion that since its conversion it has not functioned adequately as a residential property.

10.2 Impact on the Listed Building

There is a duty imposed by Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requiring decision makers, be they officers, or Council Members, to 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.

Policy ENV3 requires development to be sympathetic to their environment whilst respecting local distinctiveness, character and identity. Policy DM1 requires heritage assets to be protected in proportion to their significance and this includes the setting of the heritage asset and the public enjoyment of this. In order to secure the long term future of the heritage asset, proposals should not materially harm its significance or its setting.

The farmhouse, now converted into three dwellings and now known as Nea Farm Flats and the barn, subdivided into two further dwellings, were listed in 1987. Even though the Granary was not individually listed it is a curtilage listed building. The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) confirms that a Listed building is a building which has been designated because of its special architectural or historic interest and (unless the list entry indicates otherwise) includes not only the building itself but also:

- any object or structure fixed to the building
- any object or structure within the curtilage of the building which, although not fixed to the building, forms part of the land and has done so since before 1 July 1948

The Heritage Statement By Sarum, submitted in support of this application states:

5.12 The granary and cart shed is a curtilage listed building and therefore deemed by Historic England to be a designated heritage asset of national importance and of special interest. The building is primarily of significance as being externally a well-preserved example of a common late-18th century granary and cart shed. What sets it apart for (from) such common examples is that it forms part of a model farm designed by S. Wyatt. Internally there is little evidence to suggest it was a granary at first floor. The model farm is also generally well-preserved.

5.13 The granary and cart shed has been constructed using vernacular materials and traditional methods of construction, which provides a good record of local building traditions and an important reminder of English farming traditions. It is a characterful traditional farm building set within a historic farmstead and a rural landscape, which contributes positively to its setting.

According to the Heritage Statement Samuel Wyatt was an architect who also designed Somerley House and the model farm at Shugborough Hall Staffordshire. Throughout the 18th Century the architects designing great country houses also prepared designs for farm buildings. In these model farms, farmstead layouts depended mainly on the quadrangle, and this arrangement is reminiscent of Nea Farm.

The proposed development involves a number of separate elements which are assessed individually:

10.2.1 Fenestration changes:

It is proposed to replace the existing first floor windows in the north and south elevation, with like for like timber frame replacements but the glazing would be changed from single glazing to double glazing. A full length window would be introduced on the south elevation in a historic opening. Three rooflights are proposed on the east elevation in the roofslope of the single storey extension, and the change of a window to a door on the east elevation.

When the Granary was converted to residential use in 1999, alterations were made to the openings of the first floor windows on the north and south elevations, so the majority of these windows would not be historic. The amendments received in May removed the Juliet balconies from the south elevation and stated that the windows would be replaced with timber windows rather than aluminium. These amendments were welcome, especially the removal of the Juliet balconies which would have eroded the historic significance of the building and the contribution it makes to the wider group of buildings. The replacement of like for like windows with slimline double glazed windows would have a neutral impact on the significance of the designated heritage asset.

The proposed rooflights and French door would be on the modern single storey side extension so would not impact on historic fabric. The heritage statement states that the rooflights would be flush fitting, so would be quite discrete in this location.

To conclude the fenestration changes would not overly alter the character and appearance of the building, and the introduction of slimline double glazing would improve the energy efficiency of the building. As such this aspect of the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the building and allow it to function for its optimum use, thereby complying with statutory legislation and national and local policies.

10.2.2 Flue

A note on the proposed elevations plans, indicate that the flue proposed on the south elevation, was approved under planning reference 07/90257. However, the 2007 application gave permission for a flue to be installed on the north elevation to serve a wood burner to be installed on the first floor of the building, not the south elevation. Even though the flue would be in a different position on the building, in 2007 it was noted that there were similar structures on surrounding properties and therefore this would not adversely impact upon the character or setting of the Listed Building. The flue in itself is not considered harmful to the character and appearance of the Listed Building, and would preserve that character and appearance of the Listed Building and therefore this aspect of the proposal also

complies with statutory legislation and national and local policies.

10.2.3 Replacement brickwork to west elevation

There is no objection to this aspect of the proposal as this development would still allow for the bricked up door to be read within the elevation, and it would preserve the character and appearance of the building and allow for its significance as a previously ancillary agricultural building to be read within the context of this group of buildings. It would thereby preserve the character and appearance of the building and comply with statutory legislation and national and local policies.

10.2.4 Enclosing of cart bays, and ground floor rear window in south elevation

This group of buildings were converted to residential, as this was the optimum viable use to ensure the long term preservation of these buildings. Nevertheless, they have retained their cohesion as a unit, and the character and integrity of each of the individual buildings adds to the integrity of the whole. The infilling of the cart bays would erode the character and significance of the building. Furthermore, it would impact on the group of the buildings as a whole.

Amended plans received in May proposed glazing either side of the end post adjacent to the retained open cart bay, but this was further amended in November to introduce timber infills in response to the ecologist concerns with regard to the bat roost. The glazing around the end post did not address the concerns with regard to the enclosure of the cart bays. Furthermore, the loss of further historic fabric in the provision of an internal doorway to access the converted cart bay and the single ground floor window in the south elevation are only required to facilitate the enclosure of this space for ancillary living accommodation in conjunction with the main dwelling.

The proposed glazing to the front of the cart bays would not allow the cart bays to be read as an open space when viewed from the public realm and public right of way (Bridleway 40 follows the track to the front of the Granary on an east-west alignment). The latest amended plan has introduced an 800mm timber strip to the side of the glazing, to prevent light spill impacting upon an access point for bats which roost above the existing ceiling of the cart bays. The presence of this strip will reduce the extent of the glazing in this prominent area of the building, so it would undermine the design ethos of a sense of openness that the proposal was trying to achieve.

In correspondence dated 23 May 2024 from Draycotts, who were acting as a Planning Consultant for the applicants, it is stated: 'no privacy screening is proposed or specified; this would not be necessary.' The domestic use of this space would be clearly visible from the public realm, eroding the sense of openness that is an important feature of the building and contributes to its significance as part of a model farm designed in the 18th Century.

Even though there are individual elements of the proposed works that could be supported, as identified at 10.2.1-10.2.3 of this report, the enclosure of the cart bays would result in less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset. The Granary, by reason of its siting, is the most prominent building of the S.Wyatt designed model farm and this part of the proposed works would erode the character and significance of the listed building.

Paragraph 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: *'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'*

The building has already been successfully converted to a residential use, and functioned as such for over 20 years. Letters of support submitted on the planning application and also attached to a subsequent rebuttal from the agent suggest that the applicants by reason of their youth would be able to assist in the event of emergency help being required. However this is not considered a public benefit that would outweigh the harm that would result from the enclosure of the cart bays. As such the proposed works would not preserve or enhance the character, appearance and significance of the Listed Building and would result in less than substantial harm. Therefore the proposed works would be contrary to the statutory legislation and national and local planning policies.

10.3 Impact on the character and appearance of the rural character of the area.

Policy ENV3 of the Local Plan Part 1 requires new development to achieve high quality design that contributes positively to local distinctiveness, quality of life and the character and identity of the locality.

This property is located within the countryside where Policy DM20 of the Local Plan Part 2 is also relevant. This policy only permits limited extensions to existing dwellings that are of an appropriate design, scale and appearance in keeping with the rural character of the area. This policy includes a quantitative measure whereby extensions should not normally provide an increase in floorspace of more than 30%. However, some flexibility may be applied to the quantitative element when considering proposals for conservatories.

As the proposed development would be enclosing an area already within the envelope of the building it would not be creating any new floorspace for the purposes of Policy DM20, therefore it would comply with the quantitative element of this policy.

The enclosure of the cart bays has been identified as adversely impacting upon the character and appearance of the Listed Building and the group of properties which form part of the historic farmstead, as such the proposed development would detract from the character and identity of the locality. Furthermore, it erodes the agricultural character of the Granary, which is considered of significance in this location. As such the proposed development would be contrary to Policies ENV3 and DM20.

10.4 Residential amenity

Policy ENV3 states that new development will be required to avoid unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion or overbearing impact, overlooking, shading, noise and light pollution or other adverse impacts on residential amenity.

Due to the nature of the proposed development and relationship with other properties within the complex of Harbridge Court, there are no identified concerns with regards to adverse impact upon residential amenity and therefore the proposed development in this respect complies with Policy ENV3. However this does not outweigh the harm identified to the character and appearance of this sensitive location.

10.5 Ecology

Policy DM2 of the Local Plan Part 2 is aimed at protecting protected species.

Early on in the process of this planning application, information was provided that suggested the Granary was a bat roost, and this was confirmed by local data. An ecology survey was requested, and subsequently a phase 1 Bat Survey was provided that confirmed that bats were present on site. Three surveys were required to be undertaken. The final report following the surveys undertaken by a qualified

ecologist was submitted on 16 September 2024. The results of the survey recorded a peak count of 760 soprano pipistrelle and three brown long-eared bats emerging from the entire building. At its peak 20 soprano pipistrelle were seen emerging from the cart bays. It was therefore concluded that the building contains a soprano pipistrelle maternity roost and a brown long-eared bat day roost. By virtue of the number of bats present at the building, this is a significant bat roost.

If there is the possibility of disturbing or destroying a bat roost, a Natural England European Protect Species (EPS) mitigation licence would be required. Initially the NFDC Ecologist objected to the proposed development, as they were of the view that the development would disturb the roost, but the applicants ecologist disputed this. However these concerns have been addressed following the receipt of amended plans which show the following:

- the timber infill between the living space and the retained open area of the cart bay
- timber partition to east of front glazing; and
- installation of false ceiling within cart bays attached to existing battens on current ceiling; and
- additional details of working methods to ensure that roosting bats are not impacted by the proposal and to avoid disturbance impacts on the retained roosts.

As such the NFDC ecologist is no longer objecting to the proposed development subject to conditions being imposed to require an updated survey on completion of works and adherence to the Method Statement. To conclude based on the updated method statement and amended plans the NFDC Ecologist is satisfied that the proposed development would be acceptable in respect of its impact on the bat roost and therefore complies with Policy DM2.

11 OTHER MATTERS

None

12 CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

Notwithstanding that there are no concerns in respect of residential amenity, and the ecology concerns have been addressed in respect of the bats, these do not outweigh the identifiable harm to the character and appearance of the Listed Building and the wider area. Even though there are aspects of the proposed development that could be acceptable there is no mechanism in place to reach a split decision.

The proposed development would be contrary to Policy DM1 of the Local Plan Part 2, as the enclosure of the cart bays would erode the agricultural character and appearance of the building, which is currently maintained by the open space at ground floor level, and its significance within this important group of buildings which are a well preserved example of a common late 18th Century granary and cart shed. This significance is elevated, as it forms part of a model historic farmstead which is arranged around a central farmstead. This group of buildings have been converted to residential, but have retained their cohesion as a unit and the character and integrity of each of the individual buildings adds to the integrity of the whole. Furthermore the proposed works would not be sympathetic to their environment, nor respect local distinctiveness, character and identity and therefore would also be contrary to Policy ENV3 of the Local Plan Part 1.

As such the proposed works would result in less than substantial harm, and there is no identified public benefit to outweigh the harm and therefore is recommended for refusal as it would be contrary to national and local planning policy, and statutory legislation.

13 RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

Reason(s) for Refusal:

1. The enclosure of the cart bays would erode the agricultural character and appearance of the curtilage listed building, which is currently maintained by the open space at ground floor level, and its significance within this important group of listed buildings which are a well preserved example of a common late 18th Century granary and cart shed; this significance is elevated, as it forms part of a model farm designed by S Wyatt. As such the proposed development would result in less than substantial harm, and there is no identified public benefit to outweigh the harm and would be contrary to Policy DM1 of the Local Plan Part 2, Policy ENV3 of the Local Plan Part 1 and chap 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Further Information:

Kate Cattermole

Telephone: 023 8028 5446



New Forest DISTRICT COUNCIL

Tel: 023 8028 5000
www.newforest.gov.uk

Mark Wyatt
Service Manager
Development Management
New Forest District Council
Appletree Court
Lyndhurst
SO43 7PA

PLANNING COMMITTEE

December 2024

The Granary
4 Harbridge Court
Somerley
24/10078 and 24/10079

LB

Scale 1:500

N.B. If printing this plan from
the internet, it will not be to
scale.

