



IMcH Planning and Development Consultancy

Ian McHugh MRTPI
20 Attewell Close
Draycott
Derbyshire
DE72 3QP

Proposed Demolition of Existing Dwelling and Stables and Erection of two New Dwellings.

The Paddocks, Bottom Lane, Upper Broughton, LE14 3BA

Applicant: Mr J Nunn

Planning/Design/Access and Heritage Statement – July 2022

Introduction

1. This statement has been prepared in support of a full planning application for the development as described in the heading above. It provides further detail about the proposal; identifies the main issues; and addresses the relevant planning policies and guidance.

The Application Site and its Surroundings

2. The application site is situated within the village of Upper Broughton. It is currently occupied by a detached dwelling (The Paddocks) and a stable block. The site is bounded by residential properties and their gardens (existing and proposed) on its northern, western and part southern boundaries and open countryside on its eastern and part southern sides.

3. The application site is within what is accepted to be the built framework of the settlement. It is also within the Conservation Area (CA). The Paddocks is a 1970's detached dwelling, which is located adjacent to a Grade II listed building known as Hill Farmhouse. The access to the site is via a private driveway leading to and from Bottom Green.

Recent Planning History

4. There has been two recent approved planning applications that are relevant to the current submission:

- i) 20/01507/FUL – Approval was granted on 16 November 2020 for an extension to The Paddocks and the erection of two new dwellings, one being on the site of the stable block; and
- ii) 221/03136/FUL – Approval granted on 11 February 2022 for the demolition of The Paddocks and the erection of a replacement dwelling.

Associated with above permissions was consent for the demolition works to The Paddocks and the stable.

5. It is also noted that there is a current live planning application for the conversion of existing garaging and stables on land to the south of the application site (reference 22/00997/FUL). This has been submitted by the owner of the neighbouring property at Corner House Farm.

The Application Proposal

6. The current proposal is to demolish both The Paddocks and the stable building and erect two new dwellings. The new houses will be in a similar position to those previously approved, but are of a different design (refer to the submitted plans).

7. Access to the proposed dwellings will be via the existing private driveway from Bottom Green (also as previously approved).

Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance

8. It is a statutory requirement that applications for planning permission are determined in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case, the Development Plan comprises the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2014 (CS) and the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies 2019 (LP2). The Upper Broughton Neighbourhood Plan (NP) was adopted on 30 January 2020 and is also a Development Plan document.

9. In addition, the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (NPPF) are also relevant. It is noted that the Development Plan accords generally with the NPPF and in this case, there are no obvious conflicts.

10. The relevant policies and material considerations are referred to in the following section in relation to the main issues.

The Main Planning Issues and the Case for the Applicant.

11. The main issues are considered to be as follows;

- The principle of development;
- The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
- The effect of the proposal on the significance of the CA and other Heritage Assets;
- The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring property, with particular regard to privacy and outlook; and
- The effect of the proposal on highway safety.

Each of these is addressed in turn below.

The Principle of Development

12. It is a simple fact that planning permission has already been granted for new dwellings on the application site. The demolition of both buildings has also been approved previously. Consequently, it must be assumed that there is no conflict with the Development Plan or with the NPPF, in terms of the principle of the development. The proposal is also comparable to the earlier approvals in terms of the number of bedrooms in each of the dwellings. It should be noted that the number of bedrooms in Unit 2 accords with pre-application advice received by the architect, having regard to the content of the NP.

Character and Appearance

13. It is an overriding requirement of the planning process that new developments should be of high quality; function well; and add quality to the area (paragraph 130 of the NPPF). Policy 10 of LP1 lists criteria against which new developments will be assessed. The list includes a requirement to reinforce

valued local characteristics. In addition, Policy 1 of LP2 requires new development to be sympathetic to the character and appearance of neighbouring buildings in terms of its scale, massing, design and materials.

14. Paragraph 130 of the NPPF also states that developments should be sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, but planning decisions should not prevent innovation or change.

15. In addition, paragraph 5.12 and Policy UB5 of the NP states that all development should contribute positively in order to maintain and enhance the character of the village. The NP also contains detailed design guidance (Appendix 4), which reinforces Policy UB5.

16. The character of the area in the vicinity of the site varies in terms of built form and the layout and pattern of development. House types differ in terms of their ages, scale and appearance, ranging from the historic Hill Farmhouse to newer developments dating from the 1970's. Plot sizes also vary in shape and size. It is also noted that the dwelling approved on the adjoining plot is of a modernist design and bears little similarity with other development in the area.

17. The application continues this mixed approach, but retains a scale and form that is not at odds with its surroundings and there will be no noticeable change to the pattern of development in the area.

18. For the above reasons, the proposal is considered to both sustain and enhance the character and appearance of the area and it accords with the provisions of the Development Plan and the NPPF, as referred to above.

Heritage Assets

19. The application site is situated within the CA and is adjacent/close to the listed Hill Farmhouse. It is a statutory requirement that local planning authorities consider the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of heritage assets when considering applications for development. Policy 11 of LP1 reaffirms this requirement, as does Policy 28 of LP2 and Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

20. The CA was designated in 1973 and includes most of the built-up area of the village and areas of open space. It also includes a number of listed buildings, including Hill Farmhouse, which dates back to the 18th century. It is understood that the building was used as a public house until 1904. It is now a residential dwelling.

21. Upper Broughton was traditionally a farming community, which is demonstrated by the existence of former farm houses and the pattern of field development surrounding the village. Over time however, newer development has taken place on infill and 'backland' sites. Whilst the historic buildings and traditional layout of the village remain, it has a more diverse character overall. It is considered that the proposed development reflects this diversity. The Council's officer has previously stated that the existing buildings on the site are not regarded as positive features, nor is the space within the site felt to be of any significance.

22. Hill Farmhouse sits in a prominent position on Bottom Green and its northern and western elevations can be viewed clearly from the highway. However, it is less visible from the east and south, due to the existence of other buildings and mature trees/vegetation. Furthermore, there is no functional link between the application site and the listed building as any original farmyard areas have been lost and developed for other purposes.

23. The Paddocks currently has the closest physical and visual relationship with Hill Farmhouse. At present, the dwelling is of typical 1970's design and appearance and it does not contribute positively to either the CA or to the setting of the listed building. Consent for the demolition of both buildings has previously been granted and circumstances have not changed in the intervening short period of time.

24. With regard to the two new dwellings, it is contended that there will be little, if any, impact on the setting of the listed building. A combination of the intervening buildings, vegetation and separation distances will mean that it will have no effect on how Hill Farmhouse is viewed, experienced or appreciated in its surroundings.

25. For the above reasons, it is concluded that the proposal will not have an adverse effect on the character or appearance of the CA or on the setting of the listed building. Accordingly, the development does not conflict with the Development Plan or with the NPPF on this issue.

Living Conditions

26. Paragraph 130 of the NPPF requires planning decisions create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Policy 10 of LP1 states that development will be considered with regard to (amongst other things) the impact on the amenity of nearby occupiers or residents. Policy 1 of LP2 is similar.

27. The proposed replacement dwelling will have similar physical and spatial relationship with the existing neighbouring properties to that that exists at present. In that respect it is not considered that the proposal will have any undue impacts in terms of privacy or outlook to existing occupants. The detailed design has been amended since pre-application discussions were held with the Council's officer, to ensure a satisfactory relationship with Hill Farmhouse.

28. Likewise, the proposed dwelling on Plot 2 will not have an adverse impact on neighbouring occupants, because of the separation distances involved.

29. In conclusion, it is considered that whilst there will be some change experienced by the occupants of neighbouring property, the change will not be harmful. Therefore, the proposal accords with the relevant provisions of the NPPF; Policy 10 of LP1; and Policy 1 of LP2.

Highway Safety

30. Policy 1 of LP2 also requires new development to provide a suitable means of access that will be safe and that adequate on-site parking is available. In addition, paragraph 111 of the NPPF states that development should only be refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety. As circumstances have not changed since the recent approvals, it is concluded that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on highway safety.

Other Matters

31. The application is supported by bat and nesting bird surveys. These were previously submitted with the earlier proposals and there is no change to the conclusions. There will be no adverse impacts on protected species and the installation of bat and nesting boxes can be the subject of conditions.

Conclusion.

32. For all of the reasons given above, it is concluded that the proposed development accords with the Development Plan and the NPPF. The principle of the development is acceptable and the development will not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area. Existing heritage assets will be preserved and there will be no increased risk to highway safety. Consequently, it is requested that planning permission should be granted.

Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI
07772 762110
ian@imchplanning.co.uk