

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - B - 25th January 2017

---

<b>AGENDA ITEM NO</b>	2
<b>APPLICATION NO</b>	3172/16
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<u>Demolition of derelict buildings and erection of detached dwelling.</u>
<b>SITE LOCATION</b>	Barns at Four Elms Farm, Norwich Road, Stonham Parva
<b>SITE AREA (Ha)</b>	0.3
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr P Watson
<b>RECEIVED</b>	July 22, 2016
<b>EXPIRY DATE</b>	September 23, 2016

---

**REASONS FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE**

The application is referred to committee for the following reason :

The applicant's agent is currently employed by the Local Planning Authority on a consultancy basis.

**PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE**

1. The agent has advised of pre-application discussions with heritage officers.

**SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

2. The site is located in Stonham Parva north of the village, to the east of the A140 with trees to the highway frontage.

The site is in the countryside and contains a range of dilapidated farm buildings. A dwelling which was previously used as a children's home lies to the north whilst there is agricultural land to the east . To the south of the site, an area of meadow land is shown as in the applicant's ownership. A public footpath runs east/west from the A140 and along the southern boundary of this land.

There is a group of residential properties to the west of the A140 with a pavement running south to the main area of the village, where there is a public house and a car wash but no other services.

The barns/granary/stable buildings on the site are in a derelict state and have been in a poor condition for many years.

**HISTORY**

3. The planning history relevant to the application site is:

3172/16	Demolition of derelict buildings and erection of detached dwelling.	Refused
0101/10	Part demolition of redundant farm buildings. Conversion, alteration and extension of redundant farm buildings to office use (use class B1). Creation of new vehicular access and parking area. Installation of private treatment plant. (Revised scheme to that submitted under reference 0656/09)	Granted 01/04/2010
0656/09	Part demolition of existing farm buildings. Conversion, restoration, alteration and change of use of redundant farm buildings and agricultural land to Use Class B1. Creation of new vehicular access and parking area. Installation of private treatment plant and all ancillary works.	Refused 28/08/2009

**PROPOSAL**

4. To demolish the existing derelict buildings and erect a detached dwelling with integral double garage set back centrally on the site. The proposed dwelling is a substantial four bedroom property in a 'T' shape with a broad appearance of a barn-like structure. Proposed materials are ebony coloured ship lap boarding, red bricks and red/orange clay pantiles with solar panels on part of the south facing roof slope.

The maximum ridge height is given as 9.45m with lower ridges being 5.8m and 6.1m.

The proposal is served by an existing vehicular access.

**POLICY**

5. **Planning Policy Guidance**

See Appendix below.

**CONSULTATIONS**

6. **MSDC Heritage Officer -**

The Heritage Team considers that the proposal would cause no harm to a heritage asset because the asset holds minimal heritage significance and its loss is adequately mitigated by appropriate recording; the proposed house is unlikely to cause harm to the setting of the listed house opposite.

The existing buildings include elements of historic farm buildings over several centuries, with some features of moderate interest, as documented in the thorough heritage statement. However, the buildings have been decaying steadily over a period of some fifteen years or more, and following a recent fire have reached a point where they possess insufficient heritage significance to merit retention. On this basis Heritage officers have in the past advised against conversion. For similar reasons we find no reason to object to removal of the buildings.

The listed house Oak House stands opposite the site. It is two-storey and stands back from the road. The proposed house will also be quite substantial, but being set back from the road behind a well-treed frontage, is not considered likely to impose unduly on the setting of the listed house.

**MSDC Arboricultural Officer -**

The mature trees to the front of this site form an effective screen and I would advise making them subject to a protective fencing condition to help ensure they are not damaged during demolition and/or construction work.

**MSDC Environmental Health ( Land Contamination ) -**

Notes the satisfactory Enviroscreen Report dated 20 July 2016 and completed contaminated land questionnaire.

I can confirm in respect of land contamination that I do not have any adverse comments and no objection to the proposed development.

I would only request that we are contacted in the event of unexpected ground conditions being encountered during construction and that the developer is made aware that the responsibility for the safe development of the site lies with them.

**SCC Highways -**

Recommends conditions relating to layout and surfacing of access, location of gates and restriction on height of frontage enclosure.

**SCC Rights of Way -**

No comments or observations to make in respect of this application affecting public footpath 17.

**SCC Archaeological Service -**

Is satisfied that the submitted Heritage Asset Assessment by Leigh Alston dated June 2015 provides a sufficiently record of the buildings in their current state and that no further archaeological recording condition is required for this application.

Request a condition stipulating that a PDF copy of this report and its CD of photographs be submitted to us at the address below for inclusion in the Suffolk Historic Environment Record.

## LOCAL AND THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

7. This is a summary of the representations received.

**None**

## ASSESSMENT

8. Principle of Development

The site lies within the countryside village of Stonham Parva where development does not normally fall within policy. However as the District does not have a Five Year Housing Supply the proposal falls to be considered against the issue of sustainability, as discussed below.

The application site is located within the countryside outside of any settlement boundary. Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy details that in areas designated as countryside development will be restricted to exceptional circumstances such as meeting affordable housing and community needs. Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy lists the defined categories which development in the countryside is restricted to. This proposal is for a market dwelling which is not listed as one of the defined categories.

As the Local Authority does not have a five year land supply for housing. Paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states;

"Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites."

Consequently policies CS1 and CS2 of the Core Strategy should not be considered to be up-to- date. On this basis residential development on the site should be considered on its own merits in relation to sustainability.

The NPPF requires that development be sustainable and that adverse impacts should not outweigh the benefits. The NPPF (paragraph 7) defines three dimensions to sustainable development - the economic role, social role and environmental role. These roles should not be considered in isolation. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF identifies that environmental, social and economic gains should be sought jointly. Therefore the Core Strategy Focussed Review 2012 (post NPPF) policy FC1 and FC1.1 seeks to secure development that improves the economic social and environmental conditions in the area and proposals must conserve and enhance local character.

Paragraph 55 of the NPPF sets out that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example where there are groups of smaller settlements development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances.

In addition, paragraph 17 of the NPPF sets out that planning should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate and to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling. Paragraph 30 and 35 of the NPPF details that authorities should encourage solutions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and development should be designed and located to give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements and have access to high quality public transport.

The development would only add a single dwelling to the local housing stock and would therefore have limited public benefit which would be outweighed by the harm resulting from the development of a new dwelling in this rural location, with future residents being reliant on motor vehicles. The proposal would also have no economic benefit beyond its initial construction.

In the light of all of the above circumstances and the location and accessibility of the site to services and facilities the proposal is not considered to represent sustainable development with regards to the environmental and economic dimension of sustainable development set out by the NPPF. This view is taken following consideration of all recent appeals.

#### Consideration of heritage assets.

The buildings on the site are not listed buildings but are of some historic interest and the application is supported by a Heritage Asset Assessment which provides a record and analysis of the complex of farm buildings.

The Heritage Team have advised that the proposal would cause no harm to a heritage asset because the asset holds minimal heritage significance and the loss is adequately mitigated by appropriate recording and the proposed house is unlikely to cause harm to the setting of the listed house, Oak House opposite.

Within such a countryside location Local Plan policies H9 relate to the conversion of rural buildings to dwellings, and HB3 relates to the conversion and alteration to historic buildings whilst Core Strategy policy CS2 permits the re-use and adaption of buildings in the countryside for appropriate purposes. The proposal does not entail the conversion of the buildings which are in a derelict state and not capable of conversion. Heritage officers have in the past advised against conversion and for similar reasons find no reason to object to removal of the buildings.

#### Design and Layout

The proposal is for a substantial detached dwelling with an appearance of a barn conversion. The overall length of the front elevation is approximately 36m which includes the living accommodation plus an attached double garage.

The proposal is set back on the site when compared to the existing derelict buildings.

#### Highway Safety (Parking, Access, Layout)

SCC Highways have recommended conditions relating to layout of the access and frontage enclosure.

31

### Residential Amenity

There is a detached dwelling to the north of the site but due to separation distances and details of design the proposal will not have an impact on residential amenity.

### Landscape Impact and Trees

The proposal will entail the lopping of lower branches to frontage trees, but they are set back behind the required visibility splay. Tree protection measures would be required.

The site and dilapidated buildings are fairly prominent when viewed looking north from the A140 and from the adjacent public footpath but do not have a wider landscape impact.

### Sustainability

The application proposes a new dwelling in the countryside, without the special circumstances identified in paragraph 55 of the NPPF. The proposal is not considered to be sustainable development (see Principle of development above). Stonham Parva does not have any services and access to services further afield would be likely to be reliant on the use of the private car.

The submitted design identifies the installation of solar panels and the planning statement identifies the likely incorporation of features such as rainwater harvesting and air source heat pumps.

### Environmental Issues (Land Contamination, Ecology)

The required information on land contamination has been submitted and no objection has been raised.

The Planning Statement identifies that a previous application on the site was supported by an Ecological Survey which found no signs of bat activity. As the condition of the buildings has worsened since then it is less likely that bats would be found. Mitigation measures are proposed to protect and water voles and breeding birds on the site.

### Conclusion

The proposal would result in some element of visual improvement due to the removal of the derelict farm buildings and would add a dwelling to the housing stock. However this is not outweighed by the additional dwelling being in an unsustainable location.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**That Full Planning Permission be refused for the following reasons:**

The proposed development would represent an unjustified and unsustainable form of residential development within the countryside where residents would be dependent on the private motor car to access essential services and facilities. As

such it is contrary to development plan policies H7, CS1,CS2, FC1 and FC1.1 and the objectives of the NPPF which seek to secure sustainable development and avoid isolated dwellings in the countryside (para 55).

Philip Isbell  
Professional Lead - Growth & Sustainable Planning

Sian Bunbury  
Planning Officer

## **APPENDIX A - PLANNING POLICIES**

### **1. Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the Core Strategy Focused Review**

**CSFR-FC1 - PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

**CSFR-FC1.1 - MID SUFFOLK APPROACH TO DELIVERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

**Cor1 - CS1 Settlement Hierarchy**

**Cor2 - CS2 Development in the Countryside & Countryside Villages**

**Cor5 - CS5 Mid Suffolks Environment**

**Cor6 - CS6 Services and Infrastructure**

**Cor3 - CS3 Reduce Contributions to Climate Change**

### **2. Mid Suffolk Local Plan**

**GP1 - DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF DEVELOPMENT**

**CL8 - PROTECTING WILDLIFE HABITATS**

**H7 - RESTRICTING HOUSING DEVELOPMENT**

**CL6 - TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS**

**HB1 - PROTECTION OF HISTORIC BUILDINGS**

**RT12 - FOOTPATHS AND BRIDLEWAYS**

**HB13 - PROTECTING ANCIENT MONUMENTS**

**T10 - HIGHWAY CONSIDERATIONS IN DEVELOPMENT**

### **3. Planning Policy Statements, Circulars & Other policy**

**NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework**

## **APPENDIX B - NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS**

No letters of representation were received.