

**Application Ref:** 17/01765/FUL

**Proposal:** Demolition of farm buildings and erection of single dwelling and detached garage outbuilding with associated parking and amenity space

**Site:** Land To The East Of Manor Farm, Nene Way, Sutton, Peterborough

**Applicant:** Mr & Mrs R Facer

**Agent:** Mr J S Dadge  
Barker Storey Matthews

**Referred by:** Director of Growth and Regeneration

**Reason:** Departure from Local Plan

**Site visit:** 02.10.2017

**Case officer:** Mr M A Thomson

**Telephone No.** 01733 453478

**E-Mail:** matt.thomson@peterborough.gov.uk

**Recommendation:** **REFUSE**

## 1 Description of the site and surroundings and Summary of the proposal

### Site and Surroundings

The application site is at the north-east corner of Sutton. The land was developed as a farm yard associated with Manor Farm, however the adjacent Manor Farm (the house and stables) were separated off from the farmland and the farm yard (subject of this application) some time ago. There are various 20th-century agricultural buildings across the site, in various states of repair. These buildings are a mixture of steel and timber portal buildings with corrugated roofs of varying ridge heights from 5.8m to 9m. This tallest is a former grain dryer.

These buildings on-site are dilapidated to various extents. There is also a large area of hardstanding. The application details state that the farmyard is no longer used, although neighbours have previously commented that the access and associated track are in use.

The site is partly within, and partly outside, the village envelope boundary. All land to the west of the eastern access road is within the village boundary, and all land to the east is situated outside of the village boundary.

Between Manor Farm and the first of the row of dwelling plots to the south on Manor Road is a vacant piece of land. It appears to fit the pattern of plot layouts on Manor Road, although is about half the width of the typical plots. Outline planning permission for residential development was granted in 2001 under App Re: 01/00550/OUT. Part of the largest agricultural building just projects into the east end of this plot, but otherwise there are views out of the village across this land.

The Manor Farmhouse is a Grade 2 listed building. The Sutton Conservation Area covers the majority village, but does not include the farmyard to which this application relates.

### Pre-Amble

In 2016 planning permission was granted by the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee for the 'demolition of farm buildings and construction of 2 dwellings together with associated works'.

These dwellings were of an L shape design and to be constructed out of coursed limestone, conservation roof slate and timber openings. The dwellings would stand at 8.6m and 9.8m

respectively. These properties utilised the eastern most access into the site, and shared a single storey building situated in between, forming garages and bin storage.

To confirm this planning permission is extant and doesn't expire until July 2019, so is a material planning consideration.

Further to the previously approved 2016 scheme, the red line forming part of the site location plan has been altered. For all intents and purposes the eastern and southern redline boundary has been squared off, and would incorporate additional scrub land situated in the north east and south-east corners respectively. To confirm these areas are situated outside of the village envelope, within the open countryside.

### **Proposal**

This application seeks planning permission for the 'demolition of farm buildings and erection of single dwelling with associated parking and amenity space'.

The proposed dwelling would be sited 50m from Nene Way site frontage and would utilise both existing vehicle access points creating an in and out access arrangement. The dwelling would stand at three and two storeys in height. The main dwelling would have a floor area of 16.9m x 16.9m and proposes to stand at 7.4m to eaves and 9.5m to ridge. The two storey element would have a floor area of 7m x 16.9m proposing to stand at 4.75m to eaves and 6.6m to ridge.

A detached one and a half storey triple garage with accommodation above is also proposed to the side of the property, with a floor area of 7.3m x 16m and proposes to stand at 2.7m to eaves and 5.5m to ridge.

The description of development has been amended to include 'a detached triple garage', which originally fell under the general heading of 'associated parking'. Officers wanted the description of development to be more precise and for the avoidance of any doubt, however did not consider it necessary to re-consult on the basis that the garage building is clearly shown on the proposed plans, and there has been letters of support from neighbours and the Parish Council.

## **2 Planning History**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Date</b>
16/00349/FUL	Proposed demolition of farm buildings and construction of 2 dwellings together with associated works	Permitted	08/07/2016
14/02024/FUL	Proposed demolition of farm buildings and construction of 5 dwellings with associated works	Refused	10/04/2015

## **3 Planning Policy**

Decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan policies below, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### **Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990**

#### **Section 66 - General duty as respects listed buildings in exercise of planning functions**

The Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

#### **Section 72 - General duty as respects conservation areas in exercise of planning functions.**

The Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the Conservation Area or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic

interest which it possesses.

### **National Planning Policy Framework (2012)**

#### **Section 6 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development**

Paragraph 14 sets out that development proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay and that where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

#### **Section 12 - Conservation of Heritage Assets**

Account should be taken of the desirability of sustaining/enhancing heritage assets; the positive contribution that they can make to sustainable communities including economic viability; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. When considering the impact of a new development great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Planning permission should be refused for development which would lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance unless this is necessary to achieve public benefits that outweigh the harm/loss. In such cases all reasonable steps should be taken to ensure the new development will proceed after the harm/ loss has occurred.

### **Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011)**

#### **CS01 - Settlement Hierarchy and the Countryside**

The location/ scale of new development should accord with the settlement hierarchy. Development in the countryside will be permitted only where key criteria are met.

#### **CS02 - Spatial Strategy for the Location of Residential Development**

Provision will be made for an additional 25 500 dwellings from April 2009 to March 2026 in strategic areas/allocations.

#### **CS14 - Transport**

Promotes a reduction in the need to travel, sustainable transport, the Council's UK Environment Capital aspirations and development which would improve the quality of environments for residents.

#### **CS16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm**

Design should be of high quality, appropriate to the site and area, improve the public realm, address vulnerability to crime, be accessible to all users and not result in any unacceptable impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents.

#### **CS17 - The Historic Environment**

Development should protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment including non-scheduled nationally important features and buildings of local importance.

#### **CS20 - Landscape Character**

New development should be sensitive to the open countryside. Within the Landscape Character Areas development will only be permitted where specified criteria are met.

### **Peterborough Site Allocations DPD (2012)**

#### **SA04 - Village Envelopes**

These are identified on the proposals map. Land outside of the village envelope is defined as open countryside.

## **Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Mineral and Waste Core Strategy DPD (2011)**

### **CS26 - Mineral Safeguarding Areas**

Development will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the mineral concerned is no longer of economic value, the mineral can be extracted prior to development taking place, the development will not inhibit extraction in the future, there is an overriding need for the development and prior extraction cannot be reasonably undertaken or the development is not incompatible.

## **Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012)**

### **PP01 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development**

Applications which accord with policies in the Local Plan and other Development Plan Documents will be approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where there are no relevant policies, the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### **PP02 - Design Quality**

Permission will only be granted for development which makes a positive contribution to the built and natural environment; does not have a detrimental effect on the character of the area; is sufficiently robust to withstand/adapt to climate change; and is designed for longevity.

### **PP03 - Impacts of New Development**

Permission will not be granted for development which would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, public and/or private green space or natural daylight; be overbearing or cause noise or other disturbance, odour or other pollution; fail to minimise opportunities for crime and disorder.

### **PP04 - Amenity Provision in New Residential Development**

Proposals for new residential development should be designed and located to ensure that they provide for the needs of the future residents.

### **PP05 - Prestigious Homes**

Permission will not be granted for development involving the loss of prestigious, top-of-the market housing unless there is clear evidence of appropriate marketing or new prestigious homes would be created.

### **PP07 - Occupational Dwellings in the Countryside**

Permission for a permanent dwelling will only be granted to enable an agricultural/forestry worker to live at or in the immediate vicinity of their place of work. Permission will not be granted for a new permanent dwelling in association with a proposed or newly established enterprise in the countryside.

### **PP12 - The Transport Implications of Development**

Permission will only be granted if appropriate provision has been made for safe access by all user groups and there would not be any unacceptable impact on the transportation network including highway safety.

### **PP13 - Parking Standards**

Permission will only be granted if appropriate parking provision for all modes of transport is made in accordance with standards.

### **PP15 - Nene Valley**

Development which safeguards and enhances recreation or which would bring landscape, nature conservation, heritage, cultural or amenity benefits will be supported. Development which would increase flood risk or compromise flood defences will not be permitted.

### **PP16 - The Landscaping and Biodiversity Implications of Development**

Permission will only be granted for development which makes provision for the retention of trees and natural features which contribute significantly to the local landscape or biodiversity.

### **PP17 - Heritage Assets**

Development which would affect a heritage asset will be required to preserve and enhance the significance of the asset or its setting. Development which would have detrimental impact will be refused unless there are overriding public benefits.

### **PP20 - Development on Land affected by Contamination**

Development must take into account the potential environmental impacts arising from the development itself and any former use of the site. If it cannot be established that the site can be safely developed with no significant future impacts on users or ground/surface waters, permission will be refused.

### **Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (Preliminary Draft)**

This document sets out the planning policies against which development will be assessed. It will bring together all the current Development Plan Documents into a single document. Consultation on this document took place between December 2016 and 9 February 2017. The responses are currently being reviewed. At this preliminary stage only limited weight can be attached to the policies set out therein.

## **4 Consultations/Representations**

### **Sutton Parish Council**

Support – The Parish Council welcome the application.

### **Historic England**

No objection - On the basis of the information available we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.

### **Peterborough Civic Society**

No objection - The Peterborough Civic Society neither objects or supports the proposal, advising that it is a pastiche of Georgian architecture, and as such fails to recognise the fundamental principles of Georgian proportions and design.

### **PCC Conservation Officer**

Objection - The proposed development would result in the clearing of modern steel clad and timber agricultural buildings, which have a negative impact on the setting of the Grade 2 Manor Farm and Sutton Conservation Area. Their removal would make a significant positive contribution.

However, the proposed dwelling is very large in both footprint and massing and its architectural detailing is hierarchically and architecturally dominant of its surroundings, including Manor House and its curtilage listed buildings. Manor Farm should in itself be the dominant building within its immediate setting and has been for centuries. The result of this is that the proposed dwelling and its siting would appear contrived and erode the prominence and architectural importance of the Manor Farm considerably.

Development that results in such should be resisted on the grounds of impacting on its historic significance and awkward and uncomfortably close relationship between Manor Farm and the proposed development.

The proposed house is designed in a C18 country house architectural style and design that would benefit from an isolated setting, rather than located on the edge an established settlement breaking up the established sequence of a farmstead merging into the open countryside.

The removal of the portal buildings would enhance the immediate setting of Manor Farm, but the proposed dwelling is considered to be less than sensitive to the defining characteristics of the area and its edge of settlement location.

The creation of formal gardens and in and out driveway further adds to the impact outlined above, due to its situation between an established farmstead and open countryside.

The proposal would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the setting and significance of the Grade 2 Manor Farm, and the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Sutton Conservation Area.

#### **PCC Minerals And Waste Officer (Policy)**

Object - The eastern part of the site lies within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. The proposed dwelling has two principal elevations towards Mineral Safeguarding Areas and it is considered that development of this nature is not compatible; on this basis the proposal fails to accord with policy CS26 (Mineral Safeguarding Areas), of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy.

To minimise any conflict with future quarrying activities the proposed landscaping of the site to both the north and east should be designed in such a way as to enhance screening for the development in addition to any biodiversity and landscape enhancements.

#### **PCC Archaeological Officer**

No objection - The archaeological record shows a dearth of finds within a 250m radius although, historically, the place name would suggest a possible medieval/post-medieval origin for the farm.

Cartographic evidence shows that the part of the site to be affected by redevelopment is relatively modern. In addition, most of the area is currently occupied by farm buildings the foundation of which are likely to have caused extensive damage.

There is insufficient evidence to justify a programme of archaeological work. However, given the historic origin of the site, I would invite the applicant and/or his/her agents to report any remains/finds exposed during groundwork operations. Please ensure that the applicant states his commitment in writing.

#### **PCC Peterborough Highways Services**

No objection - Subject to conditions being attached with respect to parking and turning, access details which include visibility splays, temporary construction facilities, gates to be set back, wheel cleaning during construction and informative's.

The LHA have advised that it is the intension of the Applicant to retain both accesses into the site post-development. As a result of this both access points must be reduced to residential standard i.e. both must be amended in width to 3.5m and vehicle to pedestrian visibility splays measuring 1.5m x 1.5m should be provided on both sides of each access. The splays must be measured and located from and along the back edge of the adjacent public highway.

#### **PCC Pollution Team**

The PCC Pollution Team previously raised no objections, stating 'No Objection - The granting of planning permission will alter the character of the locality and there may be potential for disturbance to the new dwelling residents from sources at Manor Farm. Should those sources result in nuisance the local authority would have a duty to require the abatement of the nuisance'.

#### **PCC Tree Officer**

No objection - There is no arboricultural objection to this proposal, subject to conditions. There are no protected trees on site. There would be some tree loss and the exact trees to be removed and retained needs to be confirmed. However, it does not appear from the tree report that the majority of the better quality trees can be retained. Tree retention along with a new landscaping scheme is important due to the site location and to ensure an attractive appearance to compliment the adjacent Conservation Area.

If the proposal is successful then it is advised that a landscaping scheme be secured by way of condition that concentrates on the roadside boundary and tree protection.

### **PCC Wildlife Officer**

No objection - The application is accompanied by an Ecological Appraisal Report (Oct 2013) and subsequent Ecological Updated Report Letter (Feb 2016).

Nesting Birds: The proposal involves the removal of dense vegetation and scrub which is likely to support nesting birds. In addition there was evidence of birds nesting inside the buildings proposed for demolition including swallows and a robin. It is therefore recommend that a standard bird nesting Informative be attached should the scheme be approved.

To mitigate for the loss of bird nesting habitat, it is requested that a range of nesting boxes are installed that cater for a number of different species, secured via a suitably worded condition.

Mammals: Evidence of rabbits was found within the site adjacent to the wall of railway sleepers. Rabbits are protected under the Wild Mammals Act 1996 from crushing, asphyxiation etc. Given that site clearance works may inadvertently cause such suffering, it is recommend that a suitably worded condition is imposed.

The majority of boundary hedges and trees are proposed to be retained and strengthened. With regard to any additional planting it is recommend the use of a range of native tree and shrub species, the detail of which may be provided via a suitably worded condition.

There are no objections to the proposal subject to the use of appropriate conditions as set out above.

### **Local Residents/Interested Parties**

Initial consultations: 2

Total number of responses: 2

Total number of objections: 0

Total number in support: 2

Two letters of support have been received from the adjacent Manor Farm, advising the following;

'We support the planning application which has been considerably thought through in its position and lack of windows facing our Grade 2 listed property. The positioning of the dwelling at the back of the plot allows full visibility of our listed property to be maintained which was a key concern of ourselves and the heritage department with the previous applications. The building application is not intrusive in terms of the overlooking of our property either due to its position behind the barn rebuild that we have just received permission for ourselves'

Submitted separately, it was also stated that there are precedents for houses being set back from the road, such as Follyfields and two properties on Graeme Road.

## **5 Assessment of the planning issues**

The main considerations are:

- a) Principle of development
- b) Impact on Manor House Farm (Grade II) and Sutton Conservation Area
- c) Residential amenity
- d) Access and highway implications
- e) Trees, landscape and ecology
- f) Minerals Safeguarding Area
- g) Archaeology

h) Developer contributions

**a) Principle of Development**

Sutton village is defined as a small village under Policy CS1 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011). The principle of infill development of up to 9 dwellings within the village envelope is therefore considered to be acceptable, subject to the application being satisfactory in all other respects.

There is an extant planning permission for two large L shaped residential dwellings on the site, established under App Ref: 16/00349/FUL. However, the redline plan for this application has since changed and the application being considered now incorporates an area of scrub land situated in the north-east and south-east corners respectively. To confirm there was a small encroachment along the eastern and southern boundary under the 2016 approved scheme, however this was due to a barn and area of hard standing being situated outside of the village envelope. These areas were included to secure a better, more comprehensive scheme.

There has been no justification for this additional encroachment into the open countryside, over and above what was secured as part of the 2016 approval, other than what appears to facilitate a larger garden to serve the proposed dwelling.

As discussed in further detail below the scheme as submitted is not supported due to its juxtaposition to the Grade 2 Manor Farm House, and the resultant impact on the hierarchy and setting of this adjacent listed building. There is no also justification provided for the additional encroachment into the open countryside outside of the settlement boundary, therefore the proposal is contrary to Policies CS1, CS2 and CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), PP2 and PP7 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012) and SA4 of the Peterborough Site Allocations DPD (2012).

**b) Mineral Safeguard Area**

The part of the site situated outside the village envelope is located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) relating to underground resources of limestone, sand and gravel. These areas are defined and allocated in order that proven mineral resources are not needlessly sterilised by non-mineral development. Development proposals on land which is not otherwise allocated should be assessed against Policy CS26 of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy.

The proposed dwelling would be situated within the settlement boundary and therefore Officers consider that it is very unlikely that mineral would be extracted right up to the edge of the village envelope and that a quarry buffer strip would abut the village envelope.

It is therefore considered that the dwelling would not form a significant constraint to extraction of the mineral. Quarrying, although it can take several years, is temporary, and sites are always remediated after extraction.

Therefore, whilst Officers recognise the existence of the adjacent Mineral Safeguarding Area, the proposed development is of a lower density to the previously approved residential scheme and it is a relatively minor encroachment into the open countryside. Therefore it is not considered that the proposed dwelling would form a significant constraint to the extraction of adjacent minerals in the future.

**c) Residential amenity of existing and future occupiers.**

Manor Farm, adjacent to the application site, is used for various activities including the keeping of horses, chickens and sometimes, according to the occupants, foals and sheep. A barn has also recently been approved under App Ref: 17/00712/FUL and 17/00713/LBC. As a consequence of keeping the livestock, there is a requirement for a muck heap. This is located just within the boundary at Manor Farm, adjacent to the shared boundary.

These existing, legitimate activities at Manor Farm may cause noise and disturbance, including



smells, of a type that maybe unacceptable to residents of the proposed dwelling. If new occupiers complained about this, and the complaint was upheld as a Nuisance by the Pollution Control section, the occupants at Manor Farm could be required to cease their activities.

It is therefore important not to allow a development that would be certain to prejudice an existing, otherwise acceptable, use. However, it is the view of the Planning Authority that people considering to develop or purchase the site would decide for themselves whether to live there, and on the edge of a village next to the Manor Farm. Future occupants should reasonably expect to experience noises and smells, on a day-to-day basis, that would be associated with an adjacent farm yard use.

This proposed dwelling and outbuilding, whilst large, do not propose any first or second floor side facing windows to the west, and there would be a separation distance of some 45 metres to Manor Farm. As such the proposal is not considered to be overbearing, or result in any adverse loss of light or privacy. To confirm a letter of support has been received from the Manor Farm House to the west.

Given the separation distances involved and intervening boundary treatments and outbuildings the proposed dwelling would not result in any significant adverse impacts on existing residents by way of overshadowing, loss of light, privacy, overbearing or noise.

Planning permission would be required to install first and second floor windows, as well as side facing roof lights, unless they were obscurely glazed, or set at specific heights. However, if planning permission were granted permitted development restrictions for the installation of windows and/or roof lights would be attached to the detached triple garage, for the avoidance of doubt.

A bedroom is proposed at first floor (Bed 4) which faces south, however when considering the juxtaposition of this bedroom and No. 5 Manor Road, the distances and angles involved, and intervening natural vegetation, this bedroom is not considered to result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, and the relationship is accepted.

Policy PP4 sets out that new dwellings must provide for adequate internal space, adequate light, privacy and noise attenuation, good quality private amenity space and well-designed bin storage. The proposed development demonstrates good levels of amenity for future occupants.

The proposed dwelling and outbuilding are both large structures, however these have been laid out to allow for good light penetration and no unacceptable mutual overlooking or overshadowing. Amenity space is adequate. Refuse bin storage could be accommodated on site.

A bin collection point would be provided at the entrance to the site, screened by wattle fencing and a native hedge. It is recognised that this is some distance to drag bins on collection days, however it is not considered reasonable to design the access road to cater for a refuse collection vehicle, as this would result in a large, over engineered access wholly out of keeping with this rural area. This bin collection point shall be secured by planning condition should permission be granted.

In this respect, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and PP3 and PP4 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

#### **d) Access and highway implications**

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) have raised no objections, subject to a number of conditions being attached with respect to the provision and retention of parking and turning, access details which include visibility splays, temporary construction facilities, gates to be set back into the site, wheel cleaning facilities during construction and a number of informative's.

The LHA have advised that it is the intension of the applicant to retain both the existing accesses

into the site post-development. As a result of this both access points must be reduced to residential standard i.e. both must be amended in width to 3.5m and vehicle to pedestrian visibility splays measuring 1.5m x 1.5m should be provided on both sides of each access. The splays must be measured and located from and along the back edge of the adjacent public highway.

Subject to the conditions set out above the proposed development is considered to accord with Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

**e) Impact on Manor House Farm (Grade II) and Sutton Conservation Area**

Historic England have raised no objection to the proposal, however they have advised that the Council should consult their own specialist Conservation and Archaeological Officers.

The Council's Conservation Officer has objected to this proposal.

As a starting point Officers are in agreement with the submitted Heritage Statement that the application site does not form part of the listed curtilage of the adjacent Manor Farm. The principal of clearing the site of the modern steel clad agricultural buildings has been supported in the past and continues to be supported. The existing steel portal buildings and C20 timber structures currently have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the approach to the village and the Sutton Conservation Area and the setting of the Grade II Listed Manor Farm. Therefore the removal of these buildings would make a significantly positive contribution to the character and appearance of the site and the Sutton Conservation Area.

Manor Farm is a prominent and historically significant dwelling within the village of Sutton. Its farmstead character, with associated barns, outbuildings and yard is part of its setting and add to its significance and to how the site has been used and has evolved over time. Some of the larger agricultural structures on the application site are clearly modern and as stated above, detract from the character and setting of the Manor Farm and its appreciation, but the agricultural character that is provided by the more traditionally constructed, curtilage listed barns and outbuildings is essentially what would be expected to the rear of this farmstead on the edge of a historic settlement (east).

Part of the significance of Manor Farm is derived from its prominence and status within a small rural settlement setting and continues to do so to this day. The NPPF (2012) seeks new development to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of a Conservation Area, (including within its setting) and development which would result in unacceptable harm should be refused.

*2016 Approved Scheme*

The previous permitted application allowed for the access road to be located outside the village envelope, with all buildings located within the envelope. It was deemed, on balance, to be acceptable to incorporate this land for access to the site, in order to allow access to the property at the rear.

The previously permitted development (16/00349/FUL) was a result of significant work by all involved and was considered appropriate, by way of providing a subservient, albeit substantial, farm house style dwelling on the frontage and a continuation of the farmstead character with a second dwelling in the style of a barn to the rear. The associated garages mirrored traditional appearance of agricultural outbuildings appropriate to the setting and hierarchy of its surroundings and most importantly retained a degree of agricultural character in the architectural detailing adjacent to the open countryside.

*The Proposal*

The design of the proposed dwelling on its own is well considered. An additional chimney centre-right would do much to balance this classically styled building. The building does appear to be a little squat in proportion, which has likely resulted from trying to keep its height as low as possible against Manor House.

The proposed dwelling is very large in both footprint and massing, this together with its grand architectural detailing would result in a dwelling which hierarchically and architecturally is very dominant in its surroundings. It would appear very dominant within the setting of Manor Farm and its curtilage listed buildings. Manor Farm should be the dominant building within its immediate setting as it has been for centuries. The siting of such a large dwelling in close proximity to Manor Farm would therefore appear contrived and erode the prominence, setting and architectural significance with Manor Farm. Through both the new dwellings design and d scale and its uncomfortably close relationship with Manor House, the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact on the historic significance on Manor Farm.

The proposed house is designed in a C18 country house architectural style and design that would be more appropriate in an isolated setting, rather than located on the edge of a village, on a former farmyard, which encroaches on the setting of the Grade II Manor Farm.

The removal of the portal buildings would enhance the immediate setting of Manor Farm, but the proposed dwelling is considered to be less than sensitive to the defining characteristics of the area and its edge of settlement location. The creation of formal gardens and in-and-out driveway further adds to the impact outlined above, due to its location between an established farmstead and open countryside.

The proposed dwelling would be highly prominent when traveling into the village along Nene Way. Rather than entering the village and viewing a sympathetic farmstead style development, that builds up to one of the foremost curtilages in the village and compliments its surrounding barns and outbuildings, this proposal would read as contrived and an anomaly. From a heritage consideration, the proposed dwelling would feature in views of Manor House, again in an uncomfortably close proximity and will impact on the historic setting of, and therefore the significance of, the Listed Building. To confirm the 2016 scheme achieved an appropriate relationship, preserving the setting of the Listed Building and Conservation Area.

Additionally, views from along The Drift towards the site would likely to result in confusing views of these two dominant properties in close proximity and impact on the setting of the listed building and its curtilage. The location of the site of the proposed development would have an impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the applicant does not acknowledge or provide any justification for this level of harm.

The proposed development will harm the significance of the Conservation Area and the listed Manor House through inappropriate development within their setting. The NPPF (2012) requires that harm to a heritage asset must be weighed against any public benefit. It is considered that the impacts upon those assets identified within these comments are significant, though less than substantial. While the harm is less than substantial, the harm is significant and the level of harm is not justified.

The harm caused by the proposal on designated heritage assets triggers the "strong presumption" against granting permission and the harm is not exceeded by the limited public benefits of the proposal.

As such the proposal does not accord with Policies CS16 or CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP2 and PP17 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012), Paragraphs 13 and 134 of the NPPF (2012) and the Sutton Conservation Area (2015).

#### **f) Biodiversity**

Wildlife - The application has been accompanied by an Ecological Appraisal Report (Oct 2013) and subsequent Ecological Updated Report Letter (Feb 2016). The proposal involves the removal of dense vegetation and scrub which is likely to support nesting birds. In addition there was evidence of birds nesting inside the buildings proposed for demolition including Swallows and a Robin. It is therefore recommend that a standard bird nesting Informative be attached to any permission

should the scheme be approved.

To mitigate for the loss of bird nesting habitat, it is requested that a range of nesting boxes are installed that cater for a number of different species. This shall be secured via a suitably worded condition.

With respect to mammals, evidence of rabbits was found within the site adjacent to the wall of railway sleepers. Rabbits are protected under the Wild Mammals Act 1996 from crushing, asphyxiation etc. Given that site clearance works may inadvertently cause such suffering, it is recommended that a suitably worded condition be imposed for the avoidance of doubt.

The majority of boundary hedges and trees are proposed to be retained and strengthened. With regard to any additional planting it is recommended the use of a range of native tree and shrub species, the detail of which may be provided via a suitably worded condition.

Trees – The Council's Tree Officer has raised no objection. There would be a tree loss and this needs to be firmed up along with tree protection. Tree retention along with a landscaping proposal is important due to the location of the site and an attractive appearance to compliment the conservation area is important to maintain.

If the proposal is successful then it is advised that a landscaping scheme is secured by way of condition that concentrates on the roadside boundary and tree protection.

The part of the site outside the village envelope is just within the Nene Valley Policy Area, as defined on the Planning Proposals Map, and covered by Policy PP15. The policy is supportive of development that would safeguard and enhance biodiversity and appropriate use of the river. Given that this designation covers a very small part of the application site, and that the designation does not go beyond the north or west site boundaries, it is not considered that the policy applies to the proposal.

Subject to conditions with respect to biodiversity enhancement and tree protection the development would accord with Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

#### **g) Archaeology**

The Council's Archaeology Officer has advised that records show limited finds within a 250m radius although, historically, the place name would suggest a possible medieval/post-medieval origin for the farm. Cartographic evidence shows that the part of the site to be affected by redevelopment is relatively modern. In addition, most of the area is currently occupied by farm buildings the foundation of which are likely to have caused extensive damage. It is therefore considered that there is insufficient evidence to justify a programme of archaeological work. However, given the historic origin of the site it is recommended that the applicant should report any remains/finds exposed during groundwork operations. Therefore, if planning permission is granted, a note to applicant shall be attached to the decision notice for the avoidance of doubt.

#### **h) Developer contributions**

A Section 106 legal agreement is not required in this instance, as the infrastructure contribution required for this development would be secured via the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charge.

## **6 Conclusions**

The proposal is unacceptable having been assessed in light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and for the specific reasons given below.

## **7 Recommendation**

The Director of Growth and Regeneration recommends that Planning Permission is **REFUSED**

1. The proposed dwelling by reason of its overall size, mass, scale and elaborate detailing, would hierarchically and architecturally dominate the adjacent Grade II Manor Farm building and its setting. Given the close proximity and juxtaposition, the proposal would appear contrived, cramped and unacceptably erode the prominence, stature and historic significance the original Manor House and its setting. The impact would be exacerbated through the creation of formal gardens and landscaping, that would diminish the historic relationship of the Manor House, its agricultural curtilage listed farm buildings and the natural transition of built form and the open countryside. As such the proposal would have an unacceptably adverse impact on the setting and significance of the Grade II listed Manor House, and be contrary to section 66(1) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended), Policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP2 and PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012), the Sutton Conservation Area Appraisal (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework (Heritage considerations) (2012).
2. The proposed dwelling by reason of its overall size, mass, scale and proximity to the adjacent Sutton Conservation Area would fail to preserve or enhance the setting of that Conservation Area. This harm would be exacerbated through the introduction of a large, single dwelling house on this narrow farmyard site, which would unacceptably compete with the principle Grade II Manor Farm, thereby detracting from the hierarchy of buildings within the Conservation Area. Further, the unsympathetic redevelopment of this farmyard site would erode the natural transition between the built form of this Conservation village and open countryside to an unacceptable degree. As such the proposal would be contrary to section 72(1) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended), Policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP2 and PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012), the Sutton Conservation Area Appraisal (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework (Heritage considerations) (2012).
3. The proposed development would result in an unjustified extension of residential curtilage into the open countryside. Development in the countryside, outside of the boundary of all settlements in the hierarchy, is restricted to that which is demonstrably essential to the effective operation of local agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and access to greenspace, transport or utility services, or residential development which satisfies the exceptions test under Policy CS8. The dwelling would not fall into any of this criteria, and there are no special circumstances to support this encroachment into the open countryside. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies CS1, CS8 and CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), PP2 and PP7 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012) and SA4 of the Peterborough Site Allocations DPD (2012).

This page is intentionally left blank