



26 May 2021

Report to: South Cambridgeshire District
Council Planning Committee

Lead Officer: Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development

20/02531/FUL– Home Farm, Home Cottage, High Street, Graveley

Proposal: Barn replacement

Applicant: Mrs C Eayrs

Key material considerations: Principle of Development
Heritage Impact
Character/appearance of the area
Other Matters

Date of Member site visit: None

Is it a Departure Application?: No

Decision due by: 28th May 2021 (extension of time agreed)

Application brought to Committee because: The application is for the demolition of a listed building or a Building of Local Interest

Presenting officer: Tom Gray, Senior Planning Officer

Executive Summary

1. The application site is located outside the Graveley Development Framework. The site is within Flood Zone 1 (low risk). A public right of way (PROW) runs adjacent to the application site.
2. The existing barn, considered to be a curtilage listed building to the host Farmhouse and a non-designated heritage asset, has now been largely dismantled on health and safety grounds.
3. Following a formal consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, it is

considered that the harm to the curtilage listed building is 'minor' 'less than substantial' due to the re-use of salvageable historic fabric from the barn, its replacement on the same footprint and the use of appropriate matching materials. In this instance, Officers consider that any 'less than substantial harm' to this heritage asset is outweighed by the public benefits including ensuring its optimum future viable use.

4. Following a formal consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, given the re-instatement of the traditional agrarian form, use of matching materials and the re-use of any salvageable historic materials, subject to the timescale condition as agreed with the agent, Officers consider that the replacement barn would result in a positive contribution to the setting of the host listed building.
5. Officers consider that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the local area.
6. Subject to condition, Officers consider that the proposed development would not result in significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties.
7. Following a formal consultation with the Council's Ecology Officer and taking into account the dismantling of the barn above plinth level, subject to a scheme of biodiversity enhancement and lighting condition, Officers consider that the proposed development would not result in harm to protected species or habitats.
8. Officers consider that, subject to conditions, the proposed development accords with national and local planning policies.

Relevant planning history

9. S/4717/18/FL & S/4739/18/LB – Demolish existing timber barn and rebuild to match existing – Applications withdrawn
10. S/1535/19/FL – Demolish existing dilapidated barn and rebuild to match existing – Application withdrawn

Planning policies

National Planning Policy

11. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – February 2019
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
National Design Guide (NDG)

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018

12. S/1 Vision
S/2 Objectives of the Local Plan
S/3 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

S/7 Development Frameworks
HQ/1 Design Principles
NH/4 Biodiversity
NH/14 Heritage Assets
SC/9 Lighting Proposals
CC/6 Construction Methods
CC/7 Water Quality
CC/8 Sustainable Drainage Systems
CC/9 Managing Flood Risk

South Cambridgeshire Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

13. District Design Guide – Adopted March 2010
Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – Adopted January 2020
Listed Buildings: works to or affecting the setting of SPD – Adopted July 2009
Biodiversity – Adopted January 2009

Consultation

14. **Graveley Parish Council** – No comments received (out of time).
15. **Council's Conservation Officer** – Comments made on 18th November 2020:

20/02532/LBC:

- This application follows a previous one and subsequent pre app report following a site meeting. The current proposal description is somewhat misleading since the works are intended to reinstate as far as possible the existing barn and replace the rear access approach to the farmhouse. As the farm house is Grade II listed and the adjacent barn is considered to be curtilage listed, the heritage statement should cover the 5 step approach to assessment outlined in Historic England's Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 The Setting of Heritage Assets.
- Subsequent to the submission of the applications, adverse weather conditions resulted in the barn becoming a safety issue and officers agreed that the dangerous elements should be taken down, identified in relation to the structural engineer's survey and stored safely for possible reuse.
- The heritage statement initially submitted does not provide sufficient information as required in paragraph 189 of the NPPF nor sufficient justification for the reduction in length of the barn or the revised stepped access arrangement to the rear door to the farmhouse as required to mitigate for the harm caused by the reduction in length of the barn under paragraph 196.
- Taking the above into account and applying the precautionary conservation principle, it is considered that the proposal will adversely affect the character of the Listed Building. The proposals will not comply with Local Plan policy NH/14. With reference to the NPPF and the effect on the significance of the heritage asset, paragraphs 189,193 &196 would apply. Within the broad

category “less than substantial harm”, the extent of the harm is considered to be minor.

20/02531/FUL

- The impact on the Graveley Conservation Area though limited as Home Farm is located beyond its eastern boundary has not been considered in the heritage Statement.
- The impact on the setting of the Listed Building has not been identified in the Heritage Statement. Taking the above into account, it is considered that the proposal will not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. Will be detrimental to the setting of the Listed building. Will not comply with Local Plan policy NH/14. With reference to the NPPF and the effect on the significance of the heritage asset, paragraphs 189 & 196 would apply.
- Conditions: N/A
- Comments made on 31st March 2021: In view of the recent amendments, namely review/pre-demolition report and clarification that the replacement barn is on the same footprint as the existing, received in respect of the above applications, comment as follows:
 - The reversion to the original barn’s size requires a reconsideration of previous pre-app comments relating to such a proposal.
 - It is understood that the existing barn due to safety concerns has been taken down on the understanding that its elements would be identified and safely stored for potential reuse. There is no evidence that this has taken place. The information submitted is somewhat confusing as the proposed layout drawing suggests beam(s) and associated post(s) is/are intended to be reused as one of three internal frame element which are to be tied to a new structural framework.
 - Whilst a structural engineer has been involved with the project and has attended at a previous site meeting, the structural engineers updated report, whilst referred to in the now submitted Heritage Statement prepared by Greenhayes Planning Ltd has not also been submitted in connection with the amendments nor any detailed drawings outlining the new framework proposed, which though described as like-for-like would differ due to the need to meet present day structural calculations requirements.
- Comments made on 13th April 2021: In the light of the amendments, suggest the applications now be taken forward on the basis of a rebuilt like for like barn as now proposed and reusing as much salvaged material as possible (as also proposed). The rebuilding of an appropriately clad and roofed barn would be a beneficial mitigation of the harm to the setting of the Listed building from the loss of the original.
- Conditions would need to be sufficient to secure the use of appropriate materials.

16. Historic England –

- No comments offered. Seek advice from specialist conservation and archaeological advisers.

17. Council's Ecology Officer

- Comments made on 25th June 2020: The submitted Protected Species Ecology Survey (JD Ecology, February 2019) states that further bat surveys are required. No further surveys have been submitted. **Holding objection.**
- Comments made on 20th August 2020: A Bat Roost Assessment Report (JD Ecology, July 2019) has been submitted. One bat emergence survey was completed as the building was reassessed to be of low bat roost potential based on its deteriorating condition. This approach is acceptable.
- No evidence of roosting bats was found despite a small number of both pipistrelle and long-eared bat droppings (although no individual bats) being found in February 2019. Based on the photographs provided in the Bat Roost Assessment Report as well as other supporting documents including the Design and Access and Heritage Statement and Structural Report, the building appears to have deteriorated significantly since the assessment in February 2019. The building is now of very limited suitability for roosting bats due to lack of roof covering. It is reasonable to assume that this is based on increased dilapidation rather than removal based on submitted photographs (appears unstable in photographs dated May 2020).
- In previous communication, Natural England have confirmed that they would usually expect a licence application to be submitted if there has been evidence of roosting bats within the past 2-3 years, even if there is no evidence of use as present. As highlighted by the consultant in Bat Roost Assessment Report, a roost is protected by law even if bats are not present at the time of works. Unusually in this case, the roosts appear to be likely to have been lost/modified already due to the deterioration of the building. Therefore, I do not consider that a place of rest or shelter for bats will be lost as a result of the proposals, unless evidence is unexpectedly discovered during the pre-works inspection as detailed under the non-licensed method statement in Section 4.3 of the Bat Roost Assessment Report. The bats appear to have been displaced into nearby buildings as evidenced in the report. A Natural England licence will need to be sought if bats are unexpectedly found as set out in the recommendations.
- In addition, Favourable Conservation Status will need to be maintained through inclusion of integrated bat roost features. The proposals for bat roost features set out in Section 4.3 and Page 25 of the Report are acceptable and will need to be secured through a condition if consent is granted. A nesting feature for little owl should also ideally be included within the landholding.
- Please attach appropriately worded conditions to cover the following to any consent granted: **Bat Mitigation and Compliance Report.** The development hereby permitted shall be carried out only in strict accordance with the methodology in Section 4.3 of Bat Roost Assessment Report (JD Ecology, July 2019). Any amendment shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. A report produced by a suitably qualified ecologist confirming and demonstrating implementation of the recommendations together with photographic evidence of compensatory habitat features, shall be submitted to the local planning authority and

approved in writing within six months of completion of the works. Reason: To demonstrate compliance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and to provide biodiversity net gain in accordance with the Adopted South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan Policy NH/4 and Biodiversity SPD.

- External lighting should also be carefully designed due to the rural location, so please attach the following condition: **Lighting**. No external lighting shall be provided or installed within the site other than in accordance with a scheme which has been submitted to and approved in writing before installation by the local planning authority. Reason -To minimise the effects of light pollution on the surrounding area in accordance with Policy SC/9 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and to protect nearby wildlife habitat.

- Comments on 6th April 2021: No further comments.

18. **Local Highways Authority** – Comments made on 23rd June 2020 & 24th March 2021: No significant adverse effect upon public highway.

19. **Environmental Health Officer** – Recommends following conditions:
No construction site machinery or plant shall be operated, no noisy works shall be carried out and no construction related deliveries taken at or dispatched from the site except between the hours of 0800-1800 Monday to Friday, 0800-1300 Saturday and not at any time on Sundays or Bank or Public holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the locality, especially for people living and/or working nearby, in accordance with local planning policy

There shall be no burning of any waste or other materials on the site, without prior consent from the Environment Agency. A D7 exemption registered with the Environment agency is required.

Reason: To ensure nuisance is not caused to local residents.

Recommends informatives with regards air source heat pumps and noise and disturbance to neighbouring residents.

20. **Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer** – Comments made on 23rd June 2020: Acceptable subject to following condition:

Prior to commencement of development a scheme for the disposals of surface water that can be maintained for the lifetime of the development shall be provided to and agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
All external areas should utilise permeable surfaces.

Comments made on 24th March 2021: Previous comments still stand.

21. **Anglian Water** – No comments offered. Applicant should check for any Anglian

Water assets which crosses or are within close proximity to the site. Permission will be required if diverting or crossing over any assets.

22. **Asset Information Definitive Map Officer** – Whilst the Definitive Map Team has no objection to the proposal, we would point out the following which you may wish to include as informatives on any permission granted.

Public Bridleway No. 8 Graveley must remain open and unobstructed at all times. Building materials must not be stored on Public Rights of Way and contractors' vehicles must not be parked on it (it is an offence under s 137 of the Highways Act 1980 to obstruct a public Highway).

Landowners are reminded that it is their responsibility to maintain boundaries, including trees, hedges, and fences adjacent to Public Rights of way, and that any transfer of land should account for any such boundaries (s154 Highways Act 1980).

The granting of planning permission does not entitle a developer to obstruct a Public Right of Way (Circular 1/09 para 7.1).

Representations from members of the public

23. None received.

The site and its surroundings

24. The application site is located outside the Development Framework and within the countryside. The barn is considered to be curtilage listed to the listed host dwelling of Home Farmhouse, No.126 High Street, a detached Grade II listed farmhouse, believed to date from the 17th Century (List Entry: 1226491). Through the application process, the building has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset due to its positive contribution to the historical farmstead. The application site is adjacent to a public right of way (PROW) that runs from High Street to the north and runs west of the barn which is subject of this application. The application site is within Flood Zone 1.

The proposal

25. The application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing barn and its replacement. The scheme has been amended to ensure that the barn would replace the existing barn on the same footprint (rather than the shortened length as originally proposed).

Planning Assessment

Key Issues

26. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application are the principle of development, heritage impact, impact upon the character and appearance of the local area, residential amenity, ecology impacts and other matters.

Principle of Development

27. Policy S/7 states that outside development frameworks, only allocations within neighbourhood plans that have come into force and development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation, and other uses which need to be located in the countryside or where supported by other policies in this plan will be permitted.
28. In this instance, the current use of the barn is in connection with the agricultural use of the farm. Given that the development is for a replacement of an existing barn and would not involve a change of use, the proposed development is acceptable in principle in accordance with Policy S/7 of the Local Plan.

Impact upon Heritage Assets

Policy Context

29. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires decision-makers to, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, 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.
30. Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019 focuses on conserving and enhancing the historic environment.
31. Paragraph 189 of the NPPF 2019 states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary.
32. Paragraph 190 of the NPPF states that Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the

heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

33. Paragraph 191 states that where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.
34. Paragraph 193 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
35. Paragraph 194 states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.
36. Paragraph 195 states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:
 - a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
 - b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
 - c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
 - d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.
37. Paragraph 196 states that 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.
38. Paragraph 197 states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
39. Paragraph 198 states that Local planning authorities should not permit the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred.
40. At a local level, chapter 6 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 deals with protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment.

41. Policy NH/14 of the Local Plan states that development proposals will be supported when they sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets, including their settings, such as (c) designated heritage assets, i.e. listed buildings and (d) non-designated heritage assets
42. Paragraph 6.51 of Policy NH/14 states that finding viable uses which sustain rather than compromise the significance of historic buildings is fundamental to conservation (though not possible for all buildings).
43. Policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan requires all new development to make a positive contribution to its local and wider context. Development proposals should, appropriate to their scale and nature, conserve or enhance important natural and historic assets and their setting (criterion 1d).

Impact upon the curtilage listed building (heritage asset and non-designated heritage asset)

Curtilage status

44. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 1(5) says that the listed building also includes any ancillary object or structure within the curtilage of the building, which forms part of the land and has done so since before 1st July 1948.
45. The Historic England Listed Buildings and Curtilage Historic England Advice Note 10 states that understanding curtilage rests on the particular facts of each case. It will be for the local planning authority to reach a conclusion as to whether or not buildings are within a particular curtilage.
46. The courts have said that there are three key factors to be taken into account in assessing whether a structure or object is within the curtilage of a listed building:
 - the physical layout of the listed building and the structure
 - their ownership, both historically and at the date of listing
 - the use or function of the relevant buildings, again both historically and at the date of listing.
47. The application site consists of Home Farmhouse, first listed in 1962. Ancillary structures within the historic farmyard, some of which including the current barn (Black barn) pre-dated this listing. It is understood that the barn and farmhouse have not been under separate ownership from each other. The current use of the land is partly residential with the barns within the farmyard in working agricultural use, and within the same ownership/use of the applicant. It is understood that this has not changed since its first listing. Given that this is the case and taking into account the barn's close proximity to the side door of the dwelling and no physical boundary treatments separating these from the host dwelling, following formal consultations with the Council's Conservation Officers in this current application (in addition to previous applications and pre-applications), the barn is

considered by Officers to be curtilage listed to Home Farmhouse (List Entry: 1226491).

48. Notwithstanding the above matter, an application has been prepared and submitted as both a planning application and listed building consent application and shall be assessed on the basis of its curtilage listed building status.

Site History Context

49. The proposed replacement of the existing barn has been subject of previous pre-application discussions, Conservation Officer advice and several planning applications over the course of the last five years.
50. In early 2016, a structural engineers report suggested that despite limited repairs, for health and safety reasons, in their opinion, the barn should be taken down. In 2019, another structural engineers report suggested that the retention of the building framing would neither be practical nor appropriate.
51. Conservation Officer advice in 2016 and early 2019 recommended that the building be repaired, if at all possible, and details of repairs be provided to the satisfaction of the LPA. Officers recognised the urgency of the matter and encouraged the applicant to provide temporary support to safeguard the structure and prevent further movement, including a protective covering to the exterior to avoid further water ingress and deterioration of the fabric, as a short-term measure.
52. During an on-site meeting in autumn 2019 under pre-application PRE/0305/19, it was noted how noticeably the barn had deteriorated. Given its proximity to the public bridleway and lack of viable internal use, it was considered that the dismantling and rebuild of the barn could be supported provided that sufficient heritage justification be provided and that any existing materials salvaged where possible.
53. Following this pre-app response and due to adverse weather conditions during the spring of 2020, the building suffered a major structural failure. Meanwhile a planning and listed building application was submitted. Following advice from the Council's Conservation Officer and in consultation with the building control department, it was advised that although necessary for the structure to be dismantled, any dismantling of the barn be done in such a way so that the framework be reassembled as far as possible in its original form with the elements taken down covered in a manner to avoid further harm.
54. The current application was submitted and following a consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, an updated heritage statement was required. In addition, during the course of the application, amended plans were submitted to show that the barn would now replace the existing like for like on the same footprint (rather than the shortened length as originally proposed).

Assessing the impact on the heritage asset and upon the host heritage asset

55. The proposal is for the demolition of the barn and its replacement on the same footprint as the existing. A large part of the building has been dismantled and some materials set aside for future re-use where possible. The current building has no roof structure and the timber frame has been dismantled due to rot, insect infestation and its overall poor condition. The concrete floor and brick plinth is also in a poor state of repair and is all that is remaining of the barn.
56. The barn has undergone several alterations over the years with a high degree of modern changes including machine cut timbers and a concrete floor.
57. A dilapidated shed attaching the barn to Home Cottage to the south of the site has been demolished. Given that this is a later addition and lacks architectural merit, there is no objection to demolition of this element.
58. Whilst previous Conservation Officer advice encouraged the repair of the current building, upon the 2019 pre-application site visit, it was considered that the deterioration of the building was such that a replacement building could be supported where sufficient heritage justification and reuse of historic materials could be provided.
59. The proposed barn replacement would consist of a timber frame, clad with black weatherboarding. The brick plinth would match the existing house with the existing roof covering and two cross beams retained where possible.
60. Previous Officers encouraged the stabilisation of the barn and favoured repair over replacement and it is understood that additional timber work was added following the pre-application meeting in 2016 to adhere to the Conservation Officer's advice. However, further structural surveys have demonstrated that the barn is beyond repair. Therefore, on this basis, it is considered that the barn has not suffered from any deliberate neglect and therefore Paragraph 191 would not apply in this instance. The current condition subject to sufficient mitigation should therefore be a starting place in this application's assessment.
61. Taking into account the condition of the barn's structure and following a formal consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, it is considered that the retention of salvageable materials would ensure that as much usable historic fabric of the original building is preserved, (noting that much of the building's fabric has involved the use of modern materials from the 20th Century) and any harm to the overall significance of this curtilage listed building and non-designated heritage asset would be minor in this instance. Therefore, it is considered that great weight has been given to the asset's conservation in this instance and would comply with Policy NH/14 of the Local Plan and Paragraph 193 of the NPPF 2019.
62. Whilst it is considered that 'less than substantial harm' upon this curtilage listed building and non-designated heritage asset would result from the loss of this original building, taking into account its poor condition and mitigation through

the re-use of salvageable materials by condition, the harm would be 'minor' in this instance.

63. Whilst the scale of the loss is considered to be 'minor' 'less than substantial Harm', Paragraph 196 of the NPPF 2019 is engaged, and harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
64. Due to its condition, the existing barn is currently unusable for agricultural storage. The plan form of the existing building would be re-instated in addition to two sets of timber double doors proposed on the farmyard side to allow for vehicular access. This is considered to enable the future optimum viable agricultural use of the barn.
65. Taking into account the barn's poor condition and limited loss of historic fabric, it is considered that the minor harm in this instance is outweighed by the future optimum viable use of this building and its positive contribution to the local economy and the restoration of this cultural element into the rural landscape. Therefore, the public benefits including securing its optimum viable use is considered to outweigh any harm to the curtilage listed barn and the proposal would comply with Paragraph 196 of the NPPF 2019.
66. Given the traditional agrarian form, use of matching materials, the re-instatement of the original plan form and the re-use of any salvageable historic materials, it is considered that the replacement barn would result in a positive contribution to the setting to the host listed building. In accordance with Paragraph 198 of the NPPF, to avoid total loss of this heritage asset and significant harm to the setting of this host listed building, it is considered reasonable and necessary that a condition be attached to any consent granted to ensure that following demolition, the construction of the replacement barn commences in a reasonable timescale. In this instance, the length of this timescale (within 12 months of complete demolition) has been agreed with the agent.
67. Subject to the above conditions, it is considered that the building would restore the historic farmstead layout and preserve the setting of the Listed Building in accordance with Policy NH/14 of the Local Plan and the NPPF 2019.

Impact upon the rural character and appearance of the area

68. The proposed replacement barn would ensure that the traditional agrarian form and footprint of a building adjacent to the public right of way is maintained and the farmstead's value to the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside is preserved.
69. Therefore, the proposal would preserve the local rural area and conserve historic assets and their setting in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan.

Residential Amenity

70. Given the considerable distance from nearby residential properties and the nature of the proposal that would consist of a like-for-like structure being built, it is not considered that the proposal would result in significant overlooking, overbearing or loss of light impacts upon nearby residential amenities in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan.
71. The Council's Environmental Health Officer has been consulted as part of this application. The recommended condition relating to noisy works and an informative regarding the burning of waste are considered reasonable and necessary to ensure that nearby residents are not negatively impacted by the proposed development in accordance with Policy CC/6 of the Local Plan.

Ecological impacts

72. During the course of the application and in response to the Council's Ecology Officer's holding objection, the applicant has provided a further bat report demonstrating that one bat emergence survey was completed prior to dismantling the barn on health and safety grounds.
73. Following comments from the Council's Ecology Officer on the 14th August 2020 and based on the building's deteriorating condition that necessitated the dismantling of the dangerous structure during the spring of 2020, it is considered that the building was of very limited suitability for roosting bats.
74. Given that the roosts appear to be likely to have been lost/modified already due to the deterioration of the building, it is not considered that a place of rest or shelter for bats was lost as a result of the proposed demolition of the barn.
75. Whilst the Council's Ecology Officer has recommended that the submitted Bat Mitigation and Compliance Report be conditioned as a part of any permission granted, the barn has been dismantled to plinth level and therefore this condition is no longer necessary. However, to ensure biodiversity net gain, it is considered necessary and reasonable that a scheme of ecological enhancement be provided to the LPA prior to construction of the replacement barn above slab level. Subject to this condition, the proposed replacement barn is considered to be in accordance with Policy NH/4 of the Local Plan and the Biodiversity SPD 2009.
76. In addition, due to the application site's rural location, it is considered reasonable and necessary that any external lighting should also be carefully designed and a condition be attached on any permission granted requesting that no external lighting be provided or installed within the site other than in accordance with a scheme which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Subject to this condition, the proposal is in accordance with Policy SC/9 and NH/4 of the Local Plan.

Other Matters

77. The application site is located within Flood Zone 1 (low risk). Whilst the Council's Drainage Engineer has recommended a condition in relation to surface water be conditioned on any planning consent granted, given that the applicant has indicated that the surface water will be discharged via a soakaway and the like-for-like replacement building proposed, it is not reasonable for this condition to be attached in this instance, particularly given the minor scale of development.
78. No objections from the Local Highways Authority have been received on this application with regards impacts on highways safety.
79. Following a formal response from the Asset Information Definitive Map Officer, it is considered that the recommended informatives to avoid the storage of materials and contractor vehicles on the Public Right of Way, the maintenance of the boundaries and no obstruction of the public bridleway will be attached on any permission granted.
80. Upon the request of Officers, the agent has submitted a revised site location plan showing the area of development and access within the red line of the site. The area bounded in blue is within the applicant's ownership. Given the reduction in the red line boundary and no change to the extent of the land controlled by the applicant, it is not considered necessary for re-consultation to take place in this instance.
81. For the avoidance of doubt, an informative will be attached on any permission granted to ensure that the use of the replacement barn is for agricultural use only. Any change of use would require a separate planning application.
82. Due to the current Covid-19 restrictions a site visit by the Planning Committee Members has not been undertaken.

Planning balance and conclusion

83. For the reasons set out in this report and having taken all relevant material considerations into account, it is considered that planning permission should be granted in this instance.

Recommendation

84. Officers recommend that the Planning Committee approve the application, subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Existing & Proposed Location & Site Plan PL01 Revision B
Proposed Layout and Elevations PL03 Revision A
Proposed Layout PL04 Revision 0

- 2) Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the rebuild of the replacement barn, hereby permitted, shall commence within 12 months of the complete demolition of the existing barn.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the host listed building and to ensure the retention and re-use of historic fabric in accordance with policy NH/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and the NPPF 2019.

- 3) No construction or demolition work shall be carried out and no plant or power operated machinery operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays, , unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties in accordance with Policy CC/6 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 4) Prior to any construction of the replacement barn above slab level, a scheme of ecological enhancement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include compensatory habitat features. The scheme shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To conserve and enhance ecological interests in accordance with Policies HQ/1 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 5) No external lighting shall be provided or installed within the site other than in accordance with a scheme which has been submitted to and approved in writing before installation by the local planning authority.

Reason: To minimise the effects of light pollution on the surrounding area in accordance with Policy SC/9 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and to protect nearby wildlife habitat.

- 6) The materials to be used in the external construction of the development, hereby permitted, shall re-use existing salvageable materials as specified on the plans and as described in the supporting heritage statement.

Reason: To ensure that where possible the historic fabric is preserved in accordance with Policy NH/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

Informatives

- 1) There shall be no burning of any waste or other materials on the site, without prior consent from the Environment Agency. A D7 exemption registered with the Environment agency is required.

Reason: To ensure nuisance is not caused to local residents

- 2) Public Bridleway No. 8 Graveley must remain open and unobstructed at all times. Building materials must not be stored on Public Rights of Way and contractors' vehicles must not be parked on it (it is an offence under s 137 of the Highways Act 1980 to obstruct a public Highway).
- 3) Landowners are reminded that it is their responsibility to maintain boundaries, including trees, hedges, and fences adjacent to Public Rights of way, and that any transfer of land should account for any such boundaries (s154 Highways Act 1980).
- 4) The granting of planning permission does not entitle a developer to obstruct a Public Right of Way (Circular 1/09 para 7.1).
- 5) For the avoidance of doubt, the replacement barn, hereby permitted, shall be used for agricultural purposes only.

Background Papers

The following list contains links to the documents on the Council's website and / or an indication as to where hard copies can be inspected.

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's)

Report Author:

Tom Gray – Senior Planning Officer
Telephone: 07704 018476