

## **Development Control Committee**

### **3 January 2024**

#### **Planning Application DC/23/1639/FUL – Land adjacent to Home Farm Barns, Edmunds Hill, Stradishall**

<b>Date registered:</b>	10 October 2023	<b>Expiry date:</b>	5 December 2023
<b>Case officer:</b>	Tamara Benford-Brown	<b>Recommendation:</b>	Refuse application
<b>Parish:</b>	Stradishall	<b>Ward:</b>	Clare, Hundon and Kedington
<b>Proposal:</b>	Planning application - one dwelling		
<b>Site:</b>	Land adjacent to Home Farm Barns, Edmunds Hill		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Reed		

**Synopsis:**

Application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and associated matters.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that the committee determine the attached application and associated matters.

**CONTACT CASE OFFICER:**

Tamara Benford-Brown

Email: [tamara.benford-brown@westsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:tamara.benford-brown@westsuffolk.gov.uk)

Telephone: 01284 757133

## Background:

**The application was considered by the Delegation Panel on 21 November 2023 resulting in the referral to Development Control Committee to be determined.**

**The application is recommended for REFUSAL and the Parish Council have raised no objection.**

## Proposal:

1. Planning permission is sought for a detached one and a half storey three bed dwelling. It has a footprint of 8m x 14.3m and a ridge height of 7.15m. Materials proposed include a slate roof, red brick plinth and black stained weatherboarding to the walls. Access is off the existing driveway which serves Home Farms Barns.

## Site details:

2. The application site comprises of a plot of land located outside of the Stradishall housing settlement boundary and therefore within designated countryside for planning purposes. The site comprises of an undeveloped plot with six residential properties to the north east and open countryside to the west and south and south east. The area of the site measures approx. 0.5 hectares.
3. There is a Grade II Listed building to the north east of the site (approx. 80.0m away) known as Home Farmhouse with an associated courtyard arrangement of four dwellings known as Home Farm Barns immediately east of the application site. The site is partly located within the Stradishall Conservation Area. There are no protected trees in close proximity to the site. The site is also classified as Grade 2 agricultural land (best and most versatile) and part of the site falls within the 1 in 1000 year flood risk for surface water flooding.

## Planning history:

4.

Reference	Proposal	Status	Decision date
DC/23/0711/FUL	Planning application - one dwelling with stables	Application Refused	28 July 2023

## Consultations:

### 5. **West Suffolk Private Sector Housing and Environmental Health**

No objection subject to conditions to secure acoustic insulation, construction hours and external lighting

### 6. **West Suffolk Environment Team**

Contaminated Land;

`comments have been prepared by EPS, on behalf of West Suffolk Council.

Submissions Reviewed:

1) Ground and Environmental Investigation (GEI) Ltd, Phase 1 Contamination Risk Assessment, dated March 2023.

The GEI report constitutes a Phase 1 Desk Study in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which requires adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person (paragraph 183c).

The report identifies the site to have been land associated with Home Farm throughout the recorded history, with occasional buildings having been present. Moreover, a site walkover identified sources of contamination including made ground and evidence of asbestos. undeveloped prior to construction of the existing cattle barn in the 1990s.

On this basis, the conceptual model identifies a limited number of risks to future site users and therefore recommends some limited intrusive investigation to further assess the risks. Appendix 3 includes a brief summary of the proposed works, comprising a series of trial pits for the collection of shallow soil samples. The report and proposed Phase 2 recommendations are considered suitable however I would recommend one additional item. The Phase 2 recommendations do not appear to include laboratory testing for asbestos. Given the fragments identified on site, this testing should be included within the scope of works. It is also noted that an older Phase I by AGB in 2015 for the wider farm site has been submitted. A brief review of this does not appear to highlight any further risks which would warrant assessment.

Standard contamination condition recommended.

#### Air Quality;

'Paragraph 107 of the NPPF states that 'local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, policies should take into account... e) the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.' Paragraph 112 of the NPPF states that 'applications for development should... be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.' Air Quality Planning Policy Guidance lists mitigation measures for reducing the impact of air quality and includes the provision of "infrastructure to promote modes of transport with a low impact on air quality (such as electric vehicle charging points)." St Edmundsbury Core Strategy Policy CS2, Sustainable Development, requires the conserving and, wherever possible, enhancing of natural resources including, air quality. Policy DM14 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document states that proposals for all new developments should minimise all emissions ... and ensure no deterioration to either air or water quality. Section 3.4.2 of the Suffolk Parking Standards also has requirements for electrical vehicle charging infrastructure, including the installation of a suitable consumer unit capable of providing 7.4kW charge in all new dwellings. Part S of the Building Regulations requires an electric vehicle charging point to be included for new dwellings where there is an associated parking space. In this case there are associated parking spaces. We therefore do not require a planning condition requiring EV charging in this instance as this will be enforced by the building regulations, however, should the layout change we would request the opportunity to review the amendments to assess whether they impact the above conclusion.'

#### 7. **West Suffolk Conservation Officer**

'The proposed development is located within Stradishall's Conservation Area and alongside Home Farm Barns which are curtilage listed to Home Farmhouse a grade II listed building added to the list in 1961. The proposal has the potential to affect a number of listed buildings (to include the converted barns) and the character and appearance of the conservation area. the proposed development is located outside Stradishall's settlement boundary. Map regression illustrates the courtyard around which the historic barns are arranged (common to the region of East Anglia) largely remains in

place today. The barn forming the western boundary enclosing the courtyard on all four sides has since been lost.

Not dissimilar to a previous submission where Conservation objections were made due to its failure to relate to the historic courtyard arrangement, the current proposal similarly compromises the former arrangement where historically development enclosed all 4 sides of the courtyard. Whilst no assessment of significance has been provided, as required, such arrangements were commonly adopted as a means to provide a secure yard perhaps for the purposes of containing cattle. The conversion of the former barns was most likely supported on the grounds of their historic significance and the opportunity to secure their long term future. The proposed development would not result in securing the long term future of an historic barn neither would it reinstate an historic arrangement, but rather it would appear to prevent said historic arrangement from ever being reinstated. The proposals would fail to accord with policy DM15 in particular due to its failure to respect the existing buildings and their setting both today and historically causing harm to significance. The application is recommended for refusal. The NPPF requires great weight to be given to the asset's conservation with any harm or loss (to include harm arising from development within its setting ) requiring clear and convincing justification. The proposed development is considered to cause less than substantial harm (towards the upper end of less than substantial harm) to the significance of a number of heritage assets para 202 should therefore apply.'

**8. Suffolk Fire & Rescue**

No comments to make.

**9. SCC Highways**

No objection subject to conditions to secure manoeuvring and parking, cycle storage and bin storage and presentation.

**Representations:**

**10. Stradishall Parish Council**

'has no objections to this application but would like to submit the following comment: There is a potential flood risk on the land at Home Farm Barns as the barns have flooded in the past.'

11. No neighbour or public representations received.

**Policy:**

12. On 1 April 2019 Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council were replaced by a single authority, West Suffolk Council. The development plans for the previous local planning authorities were carried forward to the new Council by regulation. The development plans remain in place for the new West Suffolk Council and, with the exception of the Joint Development Management Policies Document (which had been adopted by both councils), set out policies for defined geographical areas within the new authority. It is therefore necessary to determine this application with reference to policies set out in the plans produced by the now dissolved St Edmundsbury Borough Council.

13. The following policies of the Joint Development Management Policies Document and the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy 2010 & Vision 2031 have been taken into account in the consideration of this application:

Policy DM1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy DM2 Creating Places Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness

Policy DM5 Development in the Countryside

Policy DM6 Flooding and Sustainable Drainage

Policy DM7 Sustainable Design and Construction

Policy DM10 Impact of Development on Sites of Biodiversity and Geodiversity Importance

Policy DM11 Protected Species

Policy DM12 Mitigation, Enhancement, Management and Monitoring of Biodiversity

Policy DM13 Landscape Features

Policy DM15 Listed Buildings

Policy DM17 Conservation Areas

Policy DM22 Residential Design

Policy DM27 Housing in the Countryside

Policy DM46 Parking Standards

Core Strategy Policy CS1 - St Edmundsbury Spatial Strategy

Core Strategy Policy CS2 - Sustainable Development

Core Strategy Policy CS3 - Design and Local Distinctiveness

Core Strategy Policy CS4 - Settlement Hierarchy and Identity

Policy RV1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development

Policy RV3 – Settlement boundaries

### **Other planning policy:**

#### 14. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The NPPF was revised in September 2023 and is a material consideration in decision making from the day of its publication. Paragraph 219 is clear however, that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of the revised NPPF. Due weight should be given to them according to their degree of consistency with the Framework; the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework; the greater weight that may be given. The policies set out within the Joint Development Management Policies have been

assessed in detail and are considered sufficiently aligned with the provision of the 2023 NPPF that full weight can be attached to them in the decision making process.

**Officer comment:**

15. The issues to be considered in the determination of the application are:

- Principle of Development
- Impact on Character and Appearance of the Area
- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Impact on Heritage Assets
- Highways considerations
- Ecological implications
- Other Matters

**Principle of Development**

16. The NPPF along with policies RV1 and DM1 establishes the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Development that accords with local plan policies should be approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Policy RV3 sets out that new housing will be supported within housing settlement boundaries (as defined on the policies map book) where a development is not contrary to other policies in the plan. Within the Core Strategy policy CS1 sets out the spatial strategy for the area and policy CS4 identifies the settlement hierarchy with reference to the proposals map which shows the settlement boundaries. The application site is located outside of the settlement boundary for Stradishall and is therefore classed as countryside for planning policy purposes.

17. As noted above the land is classified as Grade 2 agricultural land which is considered the best and most versatile. Para 174 of the NPPF states 'Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land.' The land does not appear to have been in agricultural use for some time (at least the last 10 years according to aerial images on the GIS). The land within the site annotated to remain as paddocks could easily revert back to agricultural use. However, the land forming the proposed dwelling and its associated curtilage would be lost from potential future agricultural use and this weighs against the scheme.

18. Policy DM5 states that areas designated as countryside will be protected from unsustainable development. Policy DM5 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document sets out the circumstances where new development will be permitted in the countryside. This policy allows new residential development associated with agriculture, forestry and equine related activities, affordable housing to meet local needs, small scale residential development in accordance with policy DM27 or replacement dwellings. Policy DM5 also seeks to protect the countryside generally from unsustainable development. It is not considered the proposal would fall within any of the circumstances permitted by DM5 and would result in an unjustified dwelling in the countryside.

19. Policy DM27 states that a new building will be permitted where it is for small scale residential development of a small undeveloped plot, subject to the following criteria:

- The development is within a closely knit 'cluster' of 10 or more existing dwellings adjacent to or fronting a highway.
- The scale of development consists of infilling a small undeveloped plot by one dwelling or a pair of semi-detached dwellings commensurate with scale and character of existing dwellings with an otherwise continuous frontage.

The policy goes on to state that permission will not be granted where a proposal harms or undermines a visually important gap that contributes to the character and distinctiveness of the rural scene, or where development would have an adverse impact on the environment or highway safety.

20. The site does not form part of a cluster of 10 or more dwellings. It is acknowledged that there are six residential properties towards the north east of the site and on the east side of Edmunds Hill. The site is also not a small undeveloped plot or part of an otherwise continuous frontage.

21. In addition, it should be noted that the Local Planning Authority is able to demonstrate a 5-year housing supply and the policies set out within the Joint Development Management Policies Document are considered sufficiently aligned with the NPPF to not be considered out of date. The Local Planning Authority is therefore under no pressure to approve development which fails to comply with policies within the development plan.

22. Consequently, the application represents unacceptable development in the countryside, and which policy DM5 aims to restrict. The proposal for an additional dwelling is unable to meet any of the exceptional criteria referred to within policy DM5 and this represents a clear and tangible conflict with the policy.

23. In addition to this, due regard should be had to the locational sustainability of the site in question. The proposal represents development outside the Stradishall settlement with only one bus stop located approx. 450m from the site along The Street. There are also limited well-established pedestrian footpaths, cycle routes and street lighting, and with other higher order settlements such as Hundon (3.5km away) and Haverhill (5km away) a fair distance from the site, occupants of the proposed new dwelling would rely principally on the car for access to day-to-day goods and services.

24. Having regard to the conflict with both national and local planning policy as set out above, the principle of development in this location is not something that the Local Planning Authority are able to support. Significant weight must therefore be attached to this very clear conflict.

### **Impact on Character and Appearance of the Area**

25. The provision of a new dwelling will need to be in accordance with policy DM2 and requires proposals to respect the character and appearance of the immediate and surrounding area, and ensure that there is not an adverse

impact upon residential amenity, highway safety or important trees within the street scene. Along with policy CS3, policy DM2 requires development to conserve and where possible enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the area. Design that does not demonstrate it has regard to local context and fails to enhance the character, appearance and environmental quality of an area will not be supported.

26. Furthermore, policy DM22 states that residential development proposals should maintain or create a sense of place and/or character by utilising the characteristics of the locality to create buildings and spaces that have a strong sense of place and distinctiveness, using an appropriate and innovative design and approach and incorporating a mix of housing and unit sizes that is appropriate for the location.
27. In the case of this application, the site comprises of an open plot of land located to the west of existing residential properties at Home Farm Barns. The site is verdant in character, and is in a rural setting, immediately adjacent to open countryside and existing paddocks.
28. The design of the proposed new dwelling comprises of a new build barn style, four-bedroom chalet bungalow with an associated paddock to the east of the plot. The materials proposed for the new dwelling include black weatherboarding, facing brick plinths and natural slates. The design of the proposal presents a new build market property in the style of a barn conversion of similar design and materials to the neighbouring dwellings at 1-4 Home Farm Barns.
29. Considering the design of the new dwelling in isolation, it is acknowledged that the form and materials compliment that of the surroundings and would be considered generally acceptable. However, the siting of a residential building in what is a rural plot within the countryside where residential development is sporadic, is out of keeping with the site's current setting. The plot is considerably larger than those forming Home Farm Barns, therefore resulting in overall harm to the wider rural character of the site and area.
30. There is likely to be limited views of the proposal from the public domain along Edmunds Hill. There are existing mature trees and hedgerows to the boundaries of the plot which would provide some screening of the development, although it is unclear who's ownership this landscaping is in. It cannot therefore be presumed that it would be retained in perpetuity. The introduction of a dwelling on a large plot in this currently rural, undeveloped site is considered to result in an urbanising effect and encroachment into the countryside. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be contrary to policies DM2 and CS3 of the development plan and the provisions within the NPPF (2023) which seeks to safeguard the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

### **Impact on Residential Amenity**

31. Policies DM2 and DM22 seek to ensure that new development does not have a detrimental impact on residential amenity, nor the amenities of the wider area. The policy states the amenities of adjacent areas by reason of noise, smell, vibration, overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light or other pollution



(including light pollution, or volume or type or vehicular activity generated), must be considered.

32. The application site has four neighbouring properties towards the north which are addressed as 1-4 Home Farm Barns. No. 4 is sited the closest to the proposed new dwelling and sits approx. 9.5m from the site. The plots for both the adjacent properties and the new dwelling are considered to be spacious and provide sufficient separation distance to alleviate concerns arising from potential amenity impacts.
33. Due to the degree of separation between the proposed dwelling and the residential dwellings to the north and east, together with the single storey height as a chalet bungalow, officers do not consider the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the neighbouring amenity of any of the nearby dwellings by reason of overlooking, loss of light, increased light pollution, noise pollution nor would it be overbearing.
34. Private Sector Housing & Environmental Health Team have been consulted on the application. No objections were raised to the development however conditions in relation to sound attenuation, construction hours and external lighting have been recommended if the application was to be approved. The development is therefore considered to accord with policies DM2 and DM22 in this regard.

### **Impact on Heritage Assets**

35. Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing a listed building or its setting or any features of special architecture or historical interest which it possesses.
36. Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
37. Policy DM15 states that proposals to alter, extend or change the use of a listed building or development affecting its setting will be permitted where they are of an appropriate scale, form, height, massing and design which respects the existing building and its setting.
38. In addition, policy DM2 and DM17 states that proposals for development within, adjacent to or visible from a Conservation Area should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area or its setting, and views into, through, and out of the area.
39. The site is located partly within the Stradishall Conservation Area. In addition, as Home Farmhouse is Grade II Listed and located in close proximity to the site, impact to the setting of the listed building and the curtilage listed buildings at Home Farm Barns, must also be considered in relation to the above policies.
40. The Conservation Officer has been consulted on the application. Map regression illustrates the courtyard around which the historic barns are arranged (common to the region of East Anglia) largely remains in place

today. The barn forming the western boundary enclosing the courtyard on all four sides has since been lost.

41. The proposed dwelling compromises the former arrangement where historically development enclosed all 4 sides of the courtyard. Whilst no assessment of significance has been provided, as required, such arrangements were commonly adopted as a means to provide a secure yard, perhaps for the purposes of containing cattle. The conversion of the former barns was most likely supported on the grounds of their historic significance and the opportunity to secure their long term future. The proposed development would not result in securing the long term future of a historic barn neither would it reinstate a historic arrangement, but rather it would appear to prevent said historic arrangement from ever being reinstated. The proposals would therefore fail to accord with policy DM15, in particular due to its failure to respect the existing buildings and their setting both today and historically, causing harm to their significance. The NPPF requires great weight to be given to the asset's conservation with any harm or loss (to include harm arising from development within its setting) requiring clear and convincing justification. The proposed development is considered to cause less than substantial harm (towards the upper end of less than substantial harm) to the significance of a number of heritage assets. Paragraph 202 of the NPPF 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'. There are no public benefits to this proposal for a market dwelling and therefore no benefit that would outweigh the harm identified.
42. The proposal fails to respect the setting of the listed building and curtilage listed courtyard farmstead. For this reason, the proposal is considered to be contrary to policy DM15.
43. Harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is also considered to arise due to the development encroaching into the open countryside, beyond the historic arrangement of nearby buildings. The proposal would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character, appearance and setting of the conservation area. The introduction of a new dwelling in this location would harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would therefore fail to accord with policy DM17.

### **Highways considerations**

44. Access to the site is off an existing driveway which also serves Home Farm Barns and parking is shown for 3 cars. Policy DM46 states that all proposals must comply with Suffolk Parking Guidance and Local Planning Authorities will seek to reduce over-reliance on the car and to promote more sustainable forms of transport. Furthermore, policy DM2 seeks to ensure that proposals maintain or enhance the safety of the highway network.
45. The highway authority has reviewed the application and stated no objection to the proposal, subject to conditions regarding the requirement for parking and manoeuvring areas to be provided and retained, bin storage areas and presentation to be provided prior to occupation, as well as an electric vehicle charging point and cycle storage. If permission were to be granted, these conditions (apart from electric vehicle charging as this is now secured through

the building regulations) are considered reasonable and necessary, and the proposal is considered to be in accordance with policy DM46 in this regard.

## **Ecological Implications**

46.As required by the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) at paragraphs 8, 174 and 180 the Local Planning Authority have a duty to consider the conservation of biodiversity and to ensure that valued landscapes or sites of biodiversity are protected when determining planning applications. At a local level, this is exhibited through policies CS2, DM10, DM11, DM12 & DM13.

47.Policy DM12 states measures should be included, as necessary and where appropriate, in the design for all developments, for the protection of biodiversity and the mitigation of any adverse impacts. Additionally, enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.

48.Noting this is a greenfield site on the edge of the open countryside and within a 200m buffer for protected and notable species (Barn Owl), no ecological assessment or details of biodiversity enhancement has been submitted with this application. Therefore, the LPA cannot confirm whether or not the proposal would have adverse impacts in relation to biodiversity. As such, the application contains insufficient information for the proposal to be assessed against policies CS2, DM10, DM11 and DM12.

## **Other Matters**

### **Land Contamination**

49.During the course of the application the Environment Team advised that based on the information provided they were satisfied that the risk of contaminated land is low. They have advised that if permission were to be granted, if during development, contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified then the developer should contact the Local Planning Authority.

### **Water Efficiency**

50.Policy DM7 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document requires developers to demonstrate water efficiency measures (and one of the options is 110 litres water use per person, per day), therefore, if permission were to be granted, it would be considered reasonable to require the more stringent water efficiency measures set out in the Building Regulations to be applied to this development, through the use of a condition.

### **Flooding**

51.The material concerns raised by the Parish are in relation to flooding, although no specific details or evidence has been provided. The application site is not located within Flood Zone 2 or 3. However, a small part of the site is identified as being within the 1 in 1000 year flood risk for surface water flooding. The Government's standing advice requires a flood risk assessment and drainage strategy to be submitted. No assessment or strategy has been provided so it is not possible to conclude that the development of the site will not cause or exacerbate flooding elsewhere. This matter also weighs against the scheme as it is contrary to policy DM6 and para 159 of the NPPF.

## Conclusion:

52. The proposed siting of a dwelling is considered harmful to the character of the countryside and wider area, and conflicts with the provisions of the development plan as a matter of principle.
53. There are no other material considerations which outweigh the harm arising from the proposal being contrary to the development plan and its impact on the rural character of the area, conservation area and setting of the listed buildings. The proposal fails to consider ecological impacts and any necessary mitigation and enhancements. The proposal also fails to properly consider flood risk.
54. The proposal is contrary to the provisions of the development plan, in particular policies DM1, DM2, DM5, DM6, DM10, DM11, DM12, DM15, DM17 DM22 and DM27 of the Joint Development Management Policies Documents and policies CS1, CS2, CS3 and CS4 of the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy and well as policies RV1 and RV3 of the Rural Vision. The proposal is also not considered to accord with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) as set out above. On this basis the application is recommended for refusal.

## Recommendation:

55. It is recommended that planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:
- 1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires the planning system to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling and focus development in sustainable locations. Policy DM5 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document (Development within the Countryside) provides that areas designated as countryside will be protected from unsustainable development and policy DM27 sets out the strict circumstances where dwellings will be permitted outside of the identified settlement boundaries. The site does not form part of a cluster of 10 or more dwelling. The site is also not a small undeveloped plot or part of an otherwise continuous frontage. The proposal does not meet the provisions of policies DM5 or DM27 and there are no material considerations which outweigh this very significant conflict with the Development Plan. The Local Planning Authority is able to demonstrate an up to date 5-year housing supply and as such, given that the principle of development in this location is not supported, are under no pressure to approve applications for development which are in conflict with the development plan. In addition, the site's location would require future occupiers of the proposed dwelling to travel to access shopping, education, employment, recreation, and social facilities. The majority of these journeys would inevitably, given the rural location, be by private motor vehicle. The proposal for an additional residential dwelling in this countryside location, beyond any defined settlement boundaries therefore represents an unsustainable form of development. Accordingly, the proposal fails to satisfy policies RV1 and RV3 of the Rural Vision, policies CS1 and CS4 of the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy 2010 and policies DM5 and DM27 of the Joint Development

- 2 Policy DM2 requires that development recognises and addresses the key features and characteristics of an area. This is reiterated in policy DM22 which seeks to secure appropriate residential design that accords with the local area, through its built form. The proposal will have a detrimental impact on the undeveloped and rural character of the locality. Given the rural setting of the site, the introduction of a permanent structure and its associated domestic paraphernalia within a large garden will erode the spacious views of Home Farm Barns which themselves contribute to the character of the local area on the edge of Stradishall. The proposal results in development which encroaches into the open countryside beyond the historic arrangement of nearby buildings. The proposal would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character, appearance and setting of the conservation area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the provisions of policies DM2, DM17 and DM22 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015 and policy CS3 of the Core Strategy 2010.
- 3 Policy DM15 states that proposals to alter, extend or change the use of a listed building or development affecting its setting will be permitted where they are of an appropriate scale, form, height, massing and design which respects the existing building and its setting. Home Farm Barns exhibits evidence of the former courtyard arrangement where maps indicate historically the yard was enclosed on all sides by buildings with the farmhouse located outside of the yard further to the north east. This arrangement is a common arrangement for farmsteads within the eastern region. The setting of the farmstead appears to have changed little according to map regression and remains undeveloped today. The development to include a dwelling and associated domestic garden would fail to relate to the enclosed courtyard arrangement of the historic farmstead and its undeveloped setting where agricultural buildings were centered around the yard. Such an arrangement was often dictated by the type of farming and use of buildings. Proposals which fail to respect the historic arrangement compromising the undeveloped setting would fail to accord with the requirement to preserve the building or its setting causing harm to significance. The NPPF requires great weight to be given to the asset's conservation with any harm or loss (to include harm arising from development within its setting) requiring clear and convincing justification. The proposed development is considered to cause less than substantial harm (towards the upper end of less than substantial harm) to the significance of a number of heritage assets. Paragraph 202 of the NPPF is therefore engaged. As a market dwelling is proposed there are no public benefits to this proposal and therefore no benefit that would outweigh the harm identified. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy DM15 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015 and paragraph 202 of the NPPF (2023).
- 4 As required by the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) at paragraphs 8, 174 and 180, the Local Planning Authority have a duty to consider the conservation of biodiversity and to ensure that valued landscapes or sites of biodiversity are protected when determining planning applications. At a local level, this is exhibited through policies CS2, DM10, DM11 and DM12. Noting this is a greenfield site on the edge of the open countryside and within a 200m buffer for protected and

notable species (Barn Owl), however, no ecological assessment or details of biodiversity enhancement has been submitted with this application. Therefore, the LPA cannot confirm whether or not the proposal would have adverse impacts in relation to biodiversity. As such, the application contains insufficient information to demonstrate compliance with policies CS2 of the Core Strategy 2010 and policies DM10, DM11 and DM12 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

- 5 Part of the site is identified as being within the 1 in 1000 year flood risk area for surface water flooding. No flood risk assessment or drainage strategy has been provided so it is not possible to determine that the development of the site will not cause or exacerbate flooding elsewhere. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy DM6 and para 159 of the NPPF which seeks to ensure new development is directed to areas of lowest flood risk.

**Documents:**

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online [DC/23/1639/FUL](https://www.barnet.gov.uk/DC/23/1639/FUL)