

NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
17 September 2014

This is information that has been received since the committee report was written. This could include additional comments or representation, new information relating to the site, changes to plans etc.

Item 6(b) – 14/04012/FUL – Royal Arthur Park, Westwells, Corsham, SN13 9SF

Box Parish Council comments, received 1st September 2014:

“The council’s previous objections still stand. When the application was granted consent the access road from Westwells Road was considered adequate. A traffic count was included in the original application.”

Head of Development Control

Additional Condition:

10. As set out within the submitted Hydrock Traffic Impact statement and Design and Access Statement, the new access and track hereby granted planning permission shall only be used only by residents of and visitors to the Royal Arthur Park retirement community as well as traffic associated with the existing Roundwood Cottage. All delivery and staff vehicles associated with the Royal Arthur Park retirement community shall continue to make use of the existing access from Westwells Road.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and so as to ensure the new access track remains limited in use and activity and thereby commensurate to its rural setting.

Item 6(c) – 14/06724/FUL & 14/06854/LBC – The Stable Barn, Westfield Farm, Nettleton, SN14 7PA

One further letter from the applicant was received. The applicant’s comments and observations have been attached to this information sheet.

Officer Comments:

The section entitled *‘Impact on the privacy and amenity of existing neighbours’* has been included in error. No objections have been raised by local residents and the Parish Council on this point. These two paragraphs should be disregarded.

Letter from applicant:

"I would refer to the planning and listed building applications submitted in the above respect and to the report that has been prepared for presentation to the meeting of the Area Planning Committee to be held on the 17th September 2014.

As there are a number of points raised in the Report that are either incorrect or misleading, I consider it necessary to address these points in this letter that I would request be brought to the attention of Members as 'late observations/material'.

1. In the section headed 'Consultations', it would appear that the comments from Conservation have resulted from the officer concerned not having visited the site or considered the contents of the application. The conversion of the open fronted byre seeks permission to alter the building from one ancillary use to a different ancillary use. There is no proposal to seek any separate residential use. The reference to the 'large four wheel drive vehicle' is also misplaced as the byre identified for 'garaging' in the original 2010 permission cannot accommodate a normal saloon car; please see attached photographs.

The proposed new building does not lie within a 'field beyond the historic farmyard' but is proposed to be built within the residential curtilage attached to the Stable Barn as part of the planning permission issued in 2010.

The failure of the officer dealing with conservation issues to note that beyond the lawful residential curtilage there exists a range of modern steel framed barns with associated accessways and outside storage areas (please see attached photographs), further confirms that no proper assessment has been made of this site and its surroundings by the Conservation officer.

2. In the section of the report relating to the 'Previously Refused Application' it will be noted that no objection was raised to the proposed alterations to the existing open fronted former cow byre. The current application does not alter those proposals although later in the Report reference is made to 'the level of glazing and fenestration detailing is not appropriate'. If this is now to be used as an objection to the development, it should have appeared as a reason for refusal of the previous application, giving the opportunity for the matter to be addressed in the current submission. It is also noted that although referred to in the body of the Report, no issue or concern is raised on this point in the reasons for refusal.

3. In the section dealing with 'Impact on the character and setting of the Heritage Assets' no reference is made to the continuing farming activity taking place from land adjoining the east boundary of the residential curtilage. Whilst some smaller agricultural buildings were removed as part of the 2010 permission, there was no requirement for the agricultural use of the larger livestock and storage buildings to cease and the buildings, yards and accessways removed. Those buildings and uses are now accessed by a newly constructed driveway located alongside the south boundary of the residential uses.

The 2010 permission authorised the residential curtilage to be attached to The Stable Barn to be laid out to the east and west of the main building. The area to the east adjoining the retained agricultural uses was shown as the 'private' garden and was not separated or enclosed by stone walls, whilst the area to the west accommodated the vehicular access, turning and parking associated with The Stable Barn. As a result of this arrangement, the portion of the curtilage to the east of the dwelling, adjacent to the modern farm buildings and yards, is the area where it is expected the residents would lay out and make use of their

garden including the placing of the usual domestic paraphernalia which officers have previously confirmed cannot be regulated by the use of planning conditions.

The current application proposes the transfer of these uses and activities to a location within the enclosure created by the complex of traditional buildings having re-located the access and parking of vehicles to the east of the dwelling. In this location the use of the garden will be screened from views beyond the complex by the relative positions of adjacent buildings and walls.

There is no 'open gap' between the dwelling and the open countryside to the east as this area is occupied by part of the residential curtilage of the dwelling with the retained modern agricultural buildings and storage yards beyond.

By failing to appreciate and consider the relationship and impact of the retained agricultural activities and buildings on the character and setting of the area and, in particular, on the proposed garage and store building, the suggestion that the proposed building will 'compete and dominate the original' is wrong in fact.

As the proposal involves the 'transfer' of domestic uses, there will be no reduction in outdoor amenity space. The 'new' area of amenity space that will replace the access, parking and turning area will adjoin similar amenity areas attached to the Farmhouse and intended to be laid out for use by future occupiers of the barn currently in the process of conversion. The proposal will not involve any material increase in 'hardsurfacing' as the area to the west of the Stable Barn will be 'softened' and rendered suitable for use as a garden attached to the dwelling. There is already a vehicular drive leading to the eastern portion of the curtilage so there is no requirement for any additional surfacing beyond the curtilage of this dwelling.

4. In the section dealing with 'Conflict with Core Strategy 58' the Report continues to ignore the buildings and activities on the adjoining land to the east. When these are taken into account, the suggestion that the proposed building will 'appear alien and contrived' and 'detract from the buildings historic origins' has no substance.

There is no requirement for a 'justification' to support the change between one ancillary domestic use to another ancillary domestic use as no 'development' is involved.

5. The first paragraph of the section dealing with 'Impact on the privacy and amenity of existing occupiers', appears to be entirely misplaced.

6. This proposal will not lead to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset. The proposed re-ordering of the domestic uses together with the provision of a building designed for and capable of accommodating a domestic vehicle will not involve any incursion into adjoining countryside. The building itself will be viewed as an extension of the existing garage buildings serving the Westfield Farmhouse and an integral part of the complex of both traditional and modern buildings which make up the present 'Westfield Farm'.

I would repeat my request that the contents of this letter be brought to the attention of the Members of the Planning Committee prior to their consideration of this application."

Photographs – Existing Garaging



Photographs – Relationship with adjoining agricultural uses



