

Planning Statement

Planning Application

Erection of a two-storey side and single-storey rear extensions, with internal alterations and rebuilding of side wall.

Wild Farm, Harper Lane, Radlett, WD7 9HJ

DLA Ref: 21/205

May 2021

CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1

2.0 SITE & CONTEXT ANALYSIS..... 2

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY 4

4.0 POLICY CONTEXT 7

5.0 THE PROPOSAL 9

6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS..... 11

7.0 CONCLUSIONS 19

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1.0 Background

1.1.1 This report relates to a planning application and listed building consent for the erection of extensions at Wild Farm, Harper Lane, Radlett WD7 9HJ.

1.2.0 Scope

1.2.1 This document comprises an overarching Planning Report. Sections 2 to 4 consider the physical, economic, social and historical context of the site, identifying the relevant local, regional and national planning policy framework; and Section 5 sets out the details of the proposal. All these sections inform the evaluation of the proposal in Section 6 against the identified planning policy framework. The overall conclusions are set out in Section 7 and which are summarised below at paragraph 1.3.0.

1.3.0 Summary

- The extensions are not considered to be a disproportionate addition over and above the original size of the dwelling and therefore would preserve the openness of the Green Belt.
- The proposals would restore the condition of the listed building and would respect its overall significance.
- The proposal would provide adequate parking and would not result in any detriment to highway safety.

2.0 SITE & CONTEXT ANALYSIS

2.1.0 Location

- 2.1.1 The application site is located approximately 1km to the north-east of Radlett Town Centre and to the south-east of Harper Lane.



Figure 1: Location of application site

2.2.0 Application Site

- 2.2.1 Wild Farm is set within large, gated grounds of about 1.8 hectares at the end of a single-track carriageway known as Lime Way. The main building is a Grade II listed property that was built in the late C18th or early C19th century and reflects an unusual example of a Palladian inspired farmhouse. Historic England's listing goes on to say that the two-storey extension on the west end is not included within the property's listing.

- 2.2.2 There are outbuildings located to the east and west of the principal dwelling, which are also excluded from the listing. The building to the west, known as the Coach House, is a converted one-bedroom studio/annexe, and a long outbuilding to the east which is in need of repair. To the south-east of the farmhouse is a partially filled-in moat.

2.3.0 Context

- 2.3.1 The property is associated with the medieval moated manorial site to the immediate east, which evidently evolved over the centuries into the farmstead. Although the site is not scheduled, its vestigial remains represented by the partially filled-in moat and provides an important historic context for the farmhouse. Furthermore, Wild Farm became the residence of the Superintendent of Harperbury Hospital (originally part of the Middlesex Colony for

Mental Defectives), which was located some 800m to the north of the site, before being cleared and redeveloped to provide 206 new dwellings by Bloor Homes.

- 2.3.2 There is also an equestrian facility some 130m to the north of the site occupying the former stables/barns to Wild Farm. Other than the nearby development to the north, the application site is set within a predominantly rural context surrounded by arable land, paddocks, and Potters Park Golf Club to the south.

2.4.0 **Proposals Map Notation**

- 2.4.1 Hertsmere's Local Plan 2012-2027 Policies Map shows that the application site is situated within the Green Belt. The southern element of the long outbuilding is covered by an archaeological designation (Policy SADM29) due to its association with the medieval moated manorial site to the immediate east. The site is not within Flood Zones 2 or 3, nor it is in a Conservation Area.



Figure 2: Extract from Hertsmere's Policies Map 2012-2027

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

3.1.0 Application Site

3.1.1 The relevant history of the application site is summarised in Figure 3.1.0 below.

LPA Ref	Proposal	Outcome
TP/06/1325	Change of use of workshop into residential accommodation with additional windows and rooflight installed and enclosure for new stairs	Withdrawn – 13/12/2006
TP/07/1199	Conversion of workshop into residential accommodation with additional windows, rooflight installed and enclosure for new stairs, as ancillary residential accommodation related to main dwelling house.	Approved – 02/07/2007
TP/07/0699	Erection of single storey front/side extension and two storey side/rear extension together with renovation of existing basement and cellar.	Withdrawn – 01/11/2007
TP/08/1480	Demolition of existing side extension & erection of two storey side extension.	Approved – 13/02/2009
TP/09/0920	Erection of side & rear extensions (Certificate of Lawful Development - Proposed)	Refused – 21/08/2009
TP/11/1662	Part demolition of an annex and existing two storey side extension; erection of part single part two storey side extension; single storey side extension; 4 rooflights on front and rear roof slopes; skylight on roof crown; and replacement of existing dormer windows	Approved – 24/10/2011
15/0185/HSE	Part demolition of annex and existing two storey side extension and erection of replacement part single part two storey side	Withdrawn – 05/05/2015

	extension and single storey side extension; rooflights to both front and rear elevations, skylight on roof crown; replacement of existing dormer windows; and cellar storage.	
16/0691/PD42	Single storey rear extension Depth - 8m Height - 4m Eaves - 3m	Refused – 25/05/2016
16/1082/PD42	Erection of single storey rear extension. Depth: 8 metres Height: 4 metres Eaves: 4 metres	Prior Approval not required – 14/07/2016
17/1858/HSE	Single storey rear extension to the main dwelling, alterations to the mansard roof of the existing two storey side extension and alterations to fenestration.	Granted – 07/12/2017
17/1859/LBC	Alterations to the roof and fenestration of the existing two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and repair and minor internal alteration works to the main dwelling. Alterations to the adjacent annexe to include changes to fenestration, refurbishment and internal layout. (Listed Building consent)	Granted – 08/12/2017
20/1570/DOC	Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 3 (new windows, doors, eaves, verges and cills) and 5 (Archaeological written scheme of investigation) of planning permission reference 17/1858/HSE	Discharged – 22/12/2020
20/1572/DOC	Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 3 (roof tile samples), 5 (schedule of works) and 6 (additional drawings) of	Discharged – 22/12/2020

planning permission reference
17/1859/LBC.

4.0 POLICY CONTEXT

4.1.0 National Policy / Guidance

4.1.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019, sets out the Government's planning policies for England. The following sections are considered directly relevant:

- Achieving Sustainable Development (Section 2);
- Decision-making (Section 4);
- Achieving well-designed places (Section 12);
- Protecting Green Belt Land (Section 13); and
- Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

4.2.0 Hertsmere Local Plans

4.2.1 This comprises the Core Strategy 2013 and the Site Allocation and Development Management Policies Plan 2015.

4.2.2 Core Strategy (January 2013)

Policy No.	Title
Policy SP1	Creating sustainable development
Policy SP2	Presumption in favour of sustainable development
Policy CS13	The Green Belt
Policy CS14	Protection or enhancement of heritage assets
Policy CS16	Environmental impact of development
Policy CS22	Securing high quality and accessible environment
Policy CS25	Accessibility and parking

4.2.3 Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (November 2016)

Policy No.	Title
Policy SADM10	Biodiversity and Habitats
Policy SADM11	Landscape Character
Policy SADM12	Trees, Landscaping and Development
Policy SADM22	Green Belt Boundary
Policy SADM26	Development Standards in the Green Belt
Policy SADM29	Heritage Assets
Policy SADM30	Design Principles
Policy SADM40	Highway and Access Criteria for New Development

4.3.0 **Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents**

- Parking Standards SPD
- Planning and Design Guide SPD
- Biodiversity and Trees SPD

5.0 THE PROPOSAL

5.1.0 The application proposal has been developed following two pre-application submissions under reference 20/0146/PA. The first proposal included the proposed re-building of the existing west wing of the listed building together with a single storey extension to the rear and the provision of a 'balancing' two storey wing to the east side which would have been linked to the existing single storey outbuilding at the rear of the site. The two-storey addition on the east side and link were deemed to be inappropriate but the proposals for the additions to the west elevation were considered to be acceptable in principle subject to some alterations to the design. The detailed comments of Essex Place Services, heritage advisors to the Council, are contained in a letter dated 26 November 2010.

5.1.1 This original proposal was revised to omit addition to the east side and link to the existing outbuilding, together with design amendments. The response of Essex Place Services is contained in a letter dated 31 March 2021. This confirmed,

'no in principle objections to rebuilding the current extension.'

But required exploration of a reduction in the height of the eaves of the replacement addition and further analysis of the ground floor extension. In addition, Essex Place Services recommended that the extension be reduced by one bay of the two-storey range and that adjustments be made to the placement of fenestration and placement of a side door.

5.1.2 The application proposals have been designed to reflect and incorporate previous detailed design advice in a manner appropriate to respond to the design and character of the listed building. The purpose of the current proposal is to achieve the sympathetic repair and restoration of the listed building ensuring the retention of existing interior and external finishes and features, in addition to works of alteration and extension.

5.1.3 The proposals include works to Wild Farm that have already been approved as the result of applications 17/1858/HSE and 17/1859/LBC. All conditions attached to these applications have been discharged as the result of applications 20/1570/DOC and 20/1572/DOC. These included the approval of materials and details of replacement windows and doors where decay precludes repair. A constructive start has been made to this development.

5.1.4 The most notable alteration to the interior of the building will be the removal of the ceiling in the entrance hall to create a light well up to the first floor, as already approved in application 17/1859/LBC. The entry to the dining room will be rationalised to provide a pair of doors in the centre of the already altered wall to the passage. New doors will match the design of the existing interior doors. Single casements will be inserted into the side

elevations of the forward projection of the building (ground floor casements approved as part of works by application 17/1859LBC). A new sash window will also be inserted in the existing recess on the east facing side elevation for the first-floor bedroom. Existing interior detailing such as skirtings, picture rails, doors, architraves, fireplaces and floors will be retained. Services will be replaced with the minimum of disruption to the existing building and historic surfaces will be repaired in a 'like for like' manner.

- 5.1.5 It is intended that the exterior of the building will be repainted with a paint appropriate to the original brickwork. In the north-east corner of the building the original red brick has been treated with both a cement slurry and paint. The removal of these later finishes has been considered but there is concern that removal is most likely to damage the underlying brickwork to an unacceptable degree. Professional advice has been sought and a proposal for the final treatment of the walls will be formulated should these applications be successful.
- 5.1.6 The application now proposes the removal and replacement of the existing two storey side extension with a single storey extension to the rear. It will have a white painted rendered external finish under a flat lead or lead substitute roof set behind a parapet. The latter will have a Portland stone coping. The proposal has been reduced in size to reflect the recommendation of Essex Place services. There has been a small adjustment to the height of the two-storey section to permit some differentiation between the proposed and existing roof line, but internal ceiling heights dictate the height of the replacement extension. A corbelled horizontal band will be provided above the first-floor windows. This is positioned below the dentil course on the existing building such that the proposed addition is visually subservient to the existing building. Visual subservience is also achieved by the use of two-pane wide sliding sash windows in the proposed extension.
- 5.1.7 The extension will provide a utility room and large open plan living area on the ground floor above a replacement basement. The side door access to the utility room is aligned with the window above on the first floor. Three bedrooms and a bathroom will be provided on the first floor.
- 5.1.8 The existing single storey outbuilding will be repaired and refurbished for ancillary residential purposes, including a workshop and storage. The connecting wall and archway access that has collapsed will be re-built.

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

Based on the analysis set out in Sections 2 to 5, I consider that the application proposal raises the following issues, which I will consider in turn below:

1. Principle
2. Layout & Design
3. Heritage & Archaeology
4. Highway Safety & Access

6.1.0 Issue No 1: Principle

6.1.1 Paragraph 133 of the NPPF states that the fundamental aim of the Government's Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, and identifies the essential characteristics of the Green Belt as being their openness and permanence. To this end paragraph 143 states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

6.1.2 Notwithstanding this, paragraph 145 confirms that whilst the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate, there are number exceptions to this, and which includes the following:

“the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling”

6.1.3 In a similar vein, Policy SADM26 of the Local Plan states that the scale of development will be controlled. In particular, *“an extension or alteration to a building must not individually or cumulatively be disproportionate to the original building; the addition(s) must be subordinate to the original”*. It should be noted the supporting text clarifies that the ‘original building’ is defined as the building that was in existence on 1st July 1948 and includes any outbuildings that are within 5m from the main dwelling.

6.1.4 The Policy continues:

“(i) developments should be located as unobtrusively as possible and advantage should be taken of site contours and landscape features in order to minimise the visual impact;

(ii) buildings should be grouped together: isolated buildings in the countryside should be avoided;

(iii) existing open and green space in the area, including garden areas, should be retained;

(iv) the scale, height and bulk of the development should be sympathetic to, and compatible with, its landscape setting and not be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt;

(v) developments should use materials which are in keeping with those of the locality, and, where modern materials are acceptable, they should be unobtrusive;

(vi) existing trees, hedgerows and other features of landscape and ecological interest should be retained and enhanced in order to enrich the character and extent of woodland in the Community Forest in line with Policy SADM12;”

6.1.5 In judging the scale of development, the Council will make a comparison between the existing and proposed development having regard to the proposed changes in floorspace, volume and site coverage of building and hardstanding; the proposed changes in height orientation of development; and the proposed change and intensity of the use(s) and the buildings at the site.

6.1.6 The Council’s Green Belt Policy and the NPPF do not provide a maximum (%) figure that would limit the proposed scale of the extensions, however in order to aid the assessment of the proposals appropriateness, the table below shows the percentage change in the footprint, floorspace and volume over and above the original dwelling of the proposed extensions (excluding the basement). It should be acknowledged that the existing two-storey side extension on the west elevation and large, single-storey outbuilding (within 5m of the main dwelling) were built prior to 1st July 1948 and therefore should be considered as part of the ‘original building’, as stated in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2016):

“In relation to a building existing on 1st July 1948, as existing on that date and, in relation to a building built after 1st July 1948, as so built. Any existing garages and outbuildings sited over 5 metres from the main dwelling will not be taken to comprise part of the “original” building.”

	Original*	Cumulative Total (with proposed)	Percentage Increase
Footprint	243 m ²	318 m ²	30%
Floorspace	459 m ²	547 m ²	19%
Volume	1,433 m ³	1839 m ³	28%

*Original includes the existing 1930s extension and the long, single-storey outbuilding to the east of the dwellinghouse

6.1.7 The proposal would effectively replace the existing two-storey side extension on the west elevation with the addition of part two-storey rear projection and the extant single-storey rear extension (17/1858/HSE & 17/1859/LBC), and therefore the increase in floorspace and volume would not be significant. There has been a small adjustment to the height of the

two-storey section from the pre-application submission to permit some differentiation between the proposed and existing roof line, but internal ceiling heights dictate the height of the replacement extension. However, the increase in height of the proposed extension over the existing 1930's extension would be marginal such that it would remain as a subordinate addition to respect the dwelling's historical significance.

- 6.1.8 As such, the proposals are not considered to be a disproportionate addition over and above the original size of the dwelling and therefore would preserve the openness of the Green Belt in accordance with paragraph 145 of the NPPF and Policy SADM26 of the Local Plan.

6.2.0 **Issue No 2: Layout & Design**

6.2.1 Character & Appearance

- 6.2.2 The relevant policies and guidance are Policies CS22 and SADM30 and the Planning and Design Guide SPD. These policies and guidance are consistent with the NPPF and require new development amongst other things to respect or improve the character of their surroundings and to preserve or enhance the special historical or architectural interest of listed buildings.
- 6.2.3 Wild Farm has been neglected for the over 20 years and, therefore, there is in urgent need to establish a scheme to bring the building back into use as a practical family home whilst ensuring that the character and interest of the building is respected and enhanced.
- 6.2.4 The existing 1930's west wing is a poorly designed addition to the listed building that detracts from the special character and appearance of Wild Farm. Therefore, it is proposed that this existing wing is demolished and replaced within an extension designed to form a subservient addition to the listed building. The replacement of the west wing will thus have a positive impact on the appearance and character of Wild Farm.
- 6.2.5 It was decided that the extension would consist of flat roof design behind a parapet wall to establish a distinction between the original building and the new, as well as avoiding any impact on the existing dormer windows to be retained. The use of 2-pane width sash windows distinguishes the addition from the core of the listed building. The height of the proposed wing has been reduced to the minimum possible consistent with providing acceptable internal head heights.
- 6.2.6 Design distinction is provided by a corbelled horizontal band above the first-floor windows and those of the single storey extension as well as an indentation on the side elevation between the proposed single and two storey additions.
- 6.2.7 The single storey rear extension to the rear wing is on a similar footprint as the extension approved in 2017. Some design changes are proposed to the exterior to ensure that it complements the overall design of the existing building. The aim is to achieve a lighter addition that has the form and appearance of a conservatory with small paned windows of proportions and design to complement the existing house.
- 6.2.8 The application scheme also includes the reconstruction of the brick wall link between the east side of the farmhouse and the existing single storey outbuilding which will be repaired. These proposals to both restore and protect constituent parts of the site will enhance the setting of the heritage asset.

6.2.9 Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

- 6.2.10 Wild Farm is set within a rural location with no residential dwellings nearby with only the equestrian centre to the north. Therefore, the proposed extension would not have any impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants in accordance with Policies CS22 and SADM30 of the Local Plan and the Planning Design SPD.

6.3.0 Issue No 3: Heritage & Archaeology

6.3.1 Policy CS14 of the Local Plan seek to ensure that all development proposals conserve or enhance the historic environment of the Borough in order to maintain and where possible improve local environmental quality. It adds that development proposals should be sensitively designed to a high quality and not cause harm to identified, protected sites, buildings or locations of heritage or archaeological value.

6.3.2 Policy SADM29 states that when applications are submitted for proposals affecting any heritage asset the applicant must clearly explain what the proposal is for and provide sufficient detail to allow for an informed decision to be made.

6.3.3 The planning application is supported by a detailed Heritage Statement (October 2020), which concludes that:

“Wild Farm has fallen into a state of disrepair due to the neglect and indecision about its future over the past 20 or so years. The condition of the building and the wider site now fails to reflect the historic significance of the site in terms of longevity of occupation and the architectural significance of the building. The intention of the proposal is to restore the listed building to the appearance and condition that it deserves to ensure a viable future. The respectful design proposed for the replacement of the existing west wing and new rear extension will enhance the existing building and overall significance of this unusual site in a manner fully consistent with established national and local planning policies.”

6.3.4 Furthermore, the Heritage Statement acknowledges that the remains of the moat to the east of Wild Farmhouse is included within an area of Archaeological Interest. It is therefore accepted that an archaeological assessment of the site will need to be undertaken in due course. The listed building consent for the construction of the single storey rear extension to Wild Farm in 2017 (17/1859/LBC) was subject to a condition requiring the submission of a written scheme of archaeological investigation.

6.3.5 In light of the above, it is considered that the proposal would be in accordance with Policies CS14 and SADM29 of the Local Plan.

6.4.0 **Issue No 4: Highway Safety & Access**

- 6.4.1 The proposal would provide sufficient parking for more than 3 spaces to the front of the property in line with Policy CS25 of the Local Plan and the Parking Standards SPD. In addition, the site would utilise existing access arrangements from the private access road and would not result in a significant increase in traffic movements within the locality. As such, it is not considered that the proposal would result in any highway safety issues.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS

7.1.0 Background

7.1.1 This report relates to a planning application and listed building consent for the erection of a two-storey side and single-storey rear extensions, with internal alterations and rebuilding of side wall at Wild Farm, Harper Lane, Radlett, WD7 9HJ. The proposal is promoted in the following circumstances:

- The extensions are not considered to be a disproportionate addition over and above the original size of the dwelling and would be limited when measured against the total floorspace of the existing property. Therefore, the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt.
- The condition of the building and the wider site now fails to reflect the historic significance of the site in terms of longevity of occupation and the architectural significance of the building. Replacing the west wing and incorporating a rear extension would restore the listed building to the appearance and condition it deserves and would respect the overall significance. As such, it considered to cause less than substantial harm with the public benefit of securing its optimal viable use.
- The proposal would not harm the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.
- The proposal would provide adequate parking and would not result in any detriment to highway safety.

DLA Town
Planning

DLA
Heritage

DLA
Strategic

DLA
Commercial

DLA
Residential

DLA
Leisure

dlatownplanning.co.uk