

Application Number:	24/10079 Listed Building Alteration
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; internal alterations (Application for listed building consent)
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 character, appearance and significance of listed building

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 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 Listed Building consent for external and internal alterations to the existing dwelling as follows:

External alterations:

- 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.

Internal alterations:

- false ceiling in proposed living/dining room
- opening in existing wall to provide internal access into converted cart bay
- installation of wood burner at ground floor level with flue
- replacement of existing staircase with spiral staircase and glazed platform at top of staircase and creation of void above ground floor
- further subdivision of first floor to create third bedroom

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
24/10078 Extension of living accommodation to replace x2no. bays of existing car port; rooflights and fenestration alterations			Awaiting determination
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
92/NFDC/50188/LBC Convert farmhouse, barn & granary (demolish extg outbldgs) :	31/01/1995	Withdrawn by Applicant	Withdrawn
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 NFDCs Conservation Officers 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 March 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

Cllr John Haywood: Support

As the ward councillor for Ringwood North and Ellingham, I concur with Ellingham, Harbridge and Ibsley Parish Council.

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.

Conservation:

Objection:

The proposed works including the amendments proposed will harm the significance of the heritage assets and do not accord with Section 16 of the NPPF 2023 or Local Plan Part 2 Sites and development Management – DM1 which requires that development should conserve or enhance the significance of heritage assets taking account of their character, appearance and setting.

9 **REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

No representations received.

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 farmyard. 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 works 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

Therefore even though the Granary is not individually listed, it is a curtilage listed building.

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 is (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 works 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 and acceptable.

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 on the north elevation to serve a wood burner to be installed on the first floor of the building. 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 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 these works 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 thereby preserving the character and appearance of the building and complying with statutory legislation and national and local policies.

10.2.4 Internal alterations

The proposed subdivision of the first floor, with the creation of a third bedroom, would reflect the position of an original grain bin, as per the floor plan submitted in support of the 1989 application. Even though this would result in the loss of openness in the loft, it would reflect the historic layout of the Granary reinforcing its historic origins as an agricultural outbuilding. The addendum to the heritage statement identifies that the existing internal staircase was a modern addition, and due to the works involved in the conversion there is unlikely to be historic fabric remaining in this area that would be adversely impacted upon by the installation of the spiral staircase.

The provision of a false ceiling within the cart bays, has been proposed as part of the latest set of amended plans received on the 20 November 2024. This ceiling would be attached to existing battens and would be between the timber posts. This false ceiling would not interfere with any historic fabric and there is no objection to this part of the proposal.

Therefore these internal alterations would not impact on the character and significance of the building and its relationship with the neighbouring listed buildings. Furthermore, it would support the function of the building in its current use as a residential dwelling, as the viable use thereby preserving the building.

10.2.5 Enclosing of cart bays, new internal access door 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, 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 10.2.1-10.2.4 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 concurrent 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.

11 OTHER MATTERS

None

12 CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

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 farm designed by S Wyatt, and forms part of a 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 LISTED BUILDING CONSENT

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. The conversion of the cart bays to ancillary domestic use would also require intervention into the existing historic fabric with the installation of an internal doorway and ground floor window which are only required due to the change of the use of the current open space. As such the proposed works 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.

