

PLANNING AND HERITAGE STATEMENT

FULL PLANNING APPLICATION FOR SINGLE STOREY
EXTENSIONS TO EAST AND WEST ELEVATIONS
FARMHOUSE, GRANGE FARM, GRANGE LANE, YORK, YO23 3RA

PLANNING PORTAL REFERENCE: PP-11207276

Prepared by Jay Everett BSC Hons MRTPI Director,
Addison Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of
Mr and Mrs A Ward

9th September 2022



CONTENTS

- 1. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE 3
- 2. INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND INFORMATION..... 4
- 3. SITE DESCRIPTION AND PLANNING HISTORY 6
- 4. PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT..... 8
- 5. ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING CASE..... 15
- 6. CONCLUSIONS 20

REFERENCE DOCUMENTS
NA

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- 1.1 My name is Jay Everett and I have been a Chartered Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute since 1993. I hold a degree in Town and Regional Planning, and I am Managing Director of Addison Planning Consultants Ltd.
- 1.2 I have 30 years of experience of working in the field of town planning, including 12 years in local government working in both planning policy and development control and 18 years acting for landowners, developers, occupiers, and investors throughout the North of England. My involvement in the property market involves the preparation of complex planning applications, strategic promotion of land and property through the local planning policy system and acting as expert witness at planning appeals.
- 1.3 My Statement deals with the planning policy context relating to the site and specifically the history of the application site, why the application scheme has been developed and the planning policy context for the proposals. I then consider the planning case for the application scheme.
- 1.4 **Chapters 2 to 4** introduce the proposal. Chapter 3 describes the site and its environs, and the planning history. Chapter 4 examines the planning policy context for the consideration of the application proposals.
- 1.5 **Chapter 5** of my Statement examines the planning case for the scheme.
- 1.6 **Chapter 6** summarises the principal conclusions from Chapters 5.

INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 This Planning Statement has been prepared on behalf of the applicants Mr and Mrs A Ward. The Application is submitted with full details as a Householder Application.

BACKGROUND

- 2.2 Grange Farm was built in 1796 and has a fold yard to the rear with a Barn and Granary. Access is via a private drive from the highway (Grange Lane). The proposals seek to extend the existing farmhouse which will see the internal layout rationalised; providing natural light, and flexible living spaces to serve modern living.

PLANNING SUBMISSION INDEX

- 2.3 The Application comprises the following plans and documents:

GF1a: APC Covering Ltr-Index 09-09-2022

GF1b: Planning Application Form 09-09-2022

GF1c: 2019-040_P100_Site Location Plan_A3_Rev

GF1d: 2019-040_P101_B1_Existing Site Plan_A3_Rev

GF2: Drawings as Proposed: Floorplans/Roof-Plan/Elevations and Sections:

2019-040_P102_B1_Proposed Site Plan_A3_Rev -

2019-040_P200_B1 Existing GF Plan_A3_Rev -

2019-040_P201_B1 Existing FF Plan_A3_Rev -

2019-040_P202_B1 Existing SF Plan_A3_Rev -

2019-040_P203_B1 Existing Roof Plan_A3_Rev -

2019-040_P205_B1 Existing Elevation 1_A3_Rev -

2019-040_P206_B1 Existing Elevation 2_A3_Rev -

2019-040_P207_B1 Existing Elevation 3_A3_Rev -

2019-040_P208_B1 Existing Elevation 4_A3_Rev -

2019-040_P209_B1 Existing Section A_A3_Rev -

2019-040_P210_B1 Proposed GF Plan_A3_Rev -

2019-040_P211_B1 Proposed FF Plan_A3_Rev -

2019-040_P212_B1 Proposed SF Plan_A3_Rev -

2019-040_P213_B1 Proposed Roof Plan_A3_Rev -

2019-040_P215_B1 Proposed Elevation 1_A3_Rev -

2019-040_P216_B1 Proposed Elevation 2_A3_Rev -

2019-040_P217_B1 Proposed Elevation 3_A3_Rev -

2019-040_P218_B1 Proposed Elevation 4_A3_Rev -

INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2019-040_P219_B1 Proposed Section A_A3_Rev -
2019-040_P220_B1 Proposed Section B_A3_Rev -

GF3: Design Access and Heritage Statement 2020-040_G05 Rev
GF4a: Visualisation No1
GF4b: Visualisation No2
GF5: Planning and Heritage Statement 09-09-2022

- 2.4 This Planning and Heritage Statement demonstrates that the proposal is a sustainable development.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 Grange Farm is an idyllic site located to the west of York in North Yorkshire, approximately 3 miles from the York City Centre, located within Knapton Parish.
- 3.2 The site is located off Grange Lane, off the A1237: a key road that runs to the west and north of York. It forms part of the York Outer Ring Road as either end of the route forms junctions with the A64 to the southwest and east of the city to act as a city distributor.
- 3.3 The site is located within Rural West York - one of the outer wards of the unitary authority of City of York. Situated to the west of the city the ward includes the villages of Askham Bryan, Askham Richard, Hessay, Knapton, Nether Poppleton, Rufforth, Skelton and Upper Poppleton.
- 3.4 The nearest local village to the site is Knapton, located approximately 1 mile to the North of the site. The aerial photograph below shows the approximate location of the site relative to the main urban area of the city located to the east.



- 3.5 The aerial photograph below shows the location of the site in more detail.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PLANNING HISTORY



- 3.6 Grange Farm was built in 1796 and has a fold yard to the rear with a Barn and Granary. Access is via a private drive from the highway (Grange Lane). The Design and Access Statement submitted with the Application sets out a full site description and contextual analysis.

PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.7 The following Planning History has been derived from the Council's Public Access database – a full Land Search has not been undertaken and there may therefore be other older planning applications relating to the site.
- 3.8 Change of use with alterations from redundant barn to offices (Class B1)
Ref. No: 98/02566/FUL | Status: Application Permitted in April 1999.
- 3.9 This permission does not relate to the farmhouse that is the subject of this Application but relates to the building identified as Building B2a in the Design and Access Statement. The Permission was implemented.

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

RELEVANT ADOPTED PLANNING POLICY

- 4.1 The Development Plan for the area includes the Yorkshire and Humber Plan Regional Spatial Strategy [RSS] to 2026. The Regional Strategy for Yorkshire and Humber (Partial Revocation) Order 2013 revoked the RSS except for: (a) the policies of the RSS set out in the Schedule to the Order; and (b) the Key Diagram of the RSS as far as it illustrates the RSS York Green Belt policies and the general extent of the Green Belt around the City of York.
- 4.2 The Schedule to the Revocation Order identifies 2 policies: i) Policy YH9 is entitled "Green Belts" and says: "*C The detailed inner boundaries of the Green Belt around York should be defined in order to establish long term development limits that safeguard the special character and setting of the historic city*"; and ii) Policy Y1 is entitled "York sub area policy". It says: "*Plans, strategies, investment decisions and programmes for the York sub area should: C Environment 1. In the City of York LDF, define the detailed boundaries of the outstanding sections of the outer boundary of the York Green Belt about 6 miles from York city centre and the inner boundary in line with policy YH9C. 2. Protect and enhance the nationally significant historical and environmental character of York, including its historic setting, views of the Minster and important open areas.*"
- 4.3 The "*Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Revocation of the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Strategy*" was published by the Department for Communities and Local Government in January 2013. The Government agreed with the Council that policies related to the York Green Belt should be retained because of the potential for significant environmental effects from their revocation. However, the Council only requested the retention of those parts of the RSS which were saved: "*...for up to 5 years or until York adopts its new local plan (whichever is the earliest)*". The Revocation Order did not however impose a time limit.
- 4.4 The Local Plan for York has never been formally Adopted. Although not formally adopted, the 'City of York Draft Local Plan' (incorporating the fourth Set of Changes, April 2005) is still used as the basis for development management decisions by the Council.
- 4.5 Relevant policies likely to be considered by York CC for an extension to an existing dwelling in this location are described below.

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

- 4.6 Other material considerations that would be considered by the Council include the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework –revised July 2021); the planning guidance published in March 2014 to support the Framework; and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 (as amended). Relevant aspects pertinent to this proposal are set out below.

NATIONAL POLICY

- 4.7 A revision to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in 2021. A summary of the key relevant text is outlined below.

NPPF SECTION 13: PROTECTING GREEN BELT LAND

- 4.8 The site lies within Green Belt land. Paragraph 138 sets out the five purposes of Green Belt, as follows:
*'a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns;
and
e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.'*
- 4.9 Paragraph 147 and 148 states:
"147. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

148. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations."
- 4.10 Paragraph 149 goes on to state:
'A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are...

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;"

- 4.11 Paragraph 149 of the revised NPPF advises that certain forms of development are not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.

NPPF SECTION 15: CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

- 4.12 Paragraph 170 of the NPPF in relation to valued landscapes, states: *'Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:*
- a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);*
 - b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland...'*

NPPF SECTION 16: CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

- 4.13 National heritage policy is set out in Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). One of twelve core principles of land-use planning set out in the NPPF is that *"planning should conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations."*
- 4.14 The policies in section 16 of the Framework refer to the concept of a heritage asset, which is defined as a building, monument, site, place, area, or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. (Annex 2: Glossary).
- 4.15 The policies in section 16 of the Framework place an emphasis on significance, which is defined as the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

may be archaeological, architectural, artistic, or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting (Annex 2: Glossary).

- 4.16 The Framework 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 asset's importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.
- 4.17 The NPPF states that in 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. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be.
- 4.18 The NPPF states that in cases where there is 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 securing its optimum viable use.

LOCAL PLANNING POLICY

Draft Local Plan (incorporating 4th set of changes 2005)

- 4.19 The City of York Draft Local Plan Incorporating the Fourth Set of Changes was approved for Development Management purposes in April 2005 (DCLP) – some 17 years ago. Whilst the DCLP does not form part of the statutory Development Plan, the Council considers its policies are capable of being material considerations in the determination of planning applications where policies relevant to the application are consistent with those in the NPPF as revised in 2021.
- 4.20 Relevant Policies which the Council are likely to refer to (amongst others) in the consideration of a new extension to an existing dwelling at this site include:
- 4.21 SP2 The York Green Belt - The primary purpose of the York Green Belt is to safeguard the setting and historic character of the City of York and is defined on the Proposals Map.
- 4.22 GB1: Development in the Green Belt. This is reproduced in full below:

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

“Within the Green Belt, planning permission for development will only be granted where:

- a) the scale, location and design of such development would not detract from the open character of the Green Belt; and*
- b) it would not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt; and*
- c) it would not prejudice the setting and special character of the City of York;*

AND it is for one of the following purposes:

- ◆ agriculture and forestry; or*
- ◆ essential facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation; or*
- ◆ cemeteries; or*
- ◆ limited extension, alteration, or replacement of existing dwellings; or*
- ◆ limited infilling in existing settlements; or*
- ◆ limited affordable housing for proven local needs; or*
- ◆ limited infilling or redevelopment of existing major developed sites;*
or
- ◆ minerals extraction, provided high environmental standards are attainable; or*
- ◆ highways works or other essential engineering operations including waste disposal; or*
- ◆ park and ride facilities; or*
- ◆ reuse of existing buildings.*

All other forms of development within the Green Belt are considered inappropriate. Very special circumstances will be required to justify instances where this presumption against development should not apply.”

- 4.23 GB4 Extensions to Existing Dwellings within the Green Belt. This is reproduced in full below:

“The extension and alteration of dwellings in the Green Belt and open countryside will be permitted providing the proposal:

- a) would not cause undue visual intrusion; and*
- b) is appropriate in terms of design and materials; and*
- c) is small scale compared to the original dwelling.”*

- 4.24 The supporting text to this Policy states:

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

“5.37 According to PPG2, proposed extensions or alterations should not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling. A figure of 25% is proposed as a guide for the purposes of assessing planning applications for this type of development. In general terms a planning application to extend a dwelling by more than 25% of the original footprint will be considered to be a large-scale addition and resisted accordingly.”

- 4.25 PPG2 has been replaced by the NPPF. The NPPF (paragraph 149(c)) does not set out any guide or maximum percentage of floorspace for the purposes of defining an appropriate scale of extension, nor does it say that extensions need to be ‘small scale’. The NPPF requires extensions to be a ‘proportionate’ addition to the original dwelling. The rigid application by the Council of this ‘guide’ would therefore clearly be inconsistent with the NPPF and cannot be afforded any material weight in the determination of this Application.
- 4.26 GP1 Design – a general design policy. Refer to page 11 of the draft Local Plan.
- 4.27 H7 Residential Extensions. This is reproduced in full below:

“Planning permission will be granted for residential extensions where:

- a) the design and materials are sympathetic to the main dwelling and the locality of the development; and*
- b) the design and scale are appropriate in relation to the main building; and*
- d) there is no adverse effect on the amenity which neighbouring residents could reasonably expect to enjoy; and*
- e) proposals respect the spaces between dwellings; and*
- g) the proposed extension does not result in an unacceptable reduction in private amenity space within the curtilage of the dwelling.”*

EMERGING LOCAL PLAN (SUBMISSION DRAFT 2018)

- 4.28 The Publication Draft City of the York Local Plan 2018 (the emerging plan) was submitted for examination on 25 May 2018 with the first set of hearings held in December 2019. The emerging plan policies are capable of being a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. However, given the level of progress with

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

Adoption, only limited weight should be afforded the emerging policies at this stage. The policies the Council are likely to consider as relevant to this application are:

GB1 Development in the Green Belt

D1 Placemaking

D11 Extensions and alterations to existing buildings

OTHER RELEVANT POLICIES/GUIDANCE

- 4.29 The House Extensions and Alterations SPD was approved in December 2012
- 4.30 The following chapter of my Statement therefore examines the case for planning within this Development Plan and planning policy context which includes the NPPF and NPPG.

ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING CASE

- 5.1 The proposal for an extension to the farmhouse is likely to give rise to the following main issues:
- Whether the proposal would have a detrimental and harmful impact upon the character and openness of the Green Belt.
 - Design and impact on character of the are

THE PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

- 5.2 The application site is located within the York Green Belt as identified in the RSS. Paragraph 149 of the NPPF states that the construction of new buildings within the Green Belt is inappropriate development. However, it lists certain forms of development which are not regarded as inappropriate. This includes at criteria c) the extension or alteration of a building if it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.
- 5.3 What constitutes a disproportionate addition is a matter for the decision maker. The original building is a building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or if constructed after this date, as originally built.
- 5.4 Policy GB1 of the emerging Local Plan identifies the extension of existing buildings as one of the purposes that will be granted provided three main criteria are met (i) the scale, location and design of development would not detract from the openness of the Green Belt, (ii) it would not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt; and (iii) it would not prejudice or harm those elements which contribute to the special character and setting of York. For the reasons explained in the preceding chapter of my Statement only limited weight can be afforded this Policy at this stage.
- 5.5 Policy GB4 of the 2005 Draft Local Plan also sets out three criteria which include that the proposed extension should be small scale compared to the original dwelling. The supporting text goes on to state that 'in general terms' an extension of more than 25% of the original footprint will be a large-scale addition.
- 5.6 For the reasons set out in the preceding chapter of my Statement the 'guide' of a percentage of floorspace is inconsistent with the NPPF and cannot be afforded any material weight. Notwithstanding,

ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING CASE

the submitted Design and Access Statement shows that the existing ground floor area is some 123 square metres and that the proposed additional ground floor area is 110 square metres.

- 5.7 Whether an extension is disproportionate cannot simply be based on mathematical calculations. An assessment needs to be undertaken in terms of the visual components of the scheme.
- 5.8 In this regard, the proposed extensions are single storey and carefully designed to ensure they do not appear as disproportionate to the original dwelling. The western facade provides only a hint of the extension that lies behind it, presenting a recognizable landscape feature that sits in front of the secondary western elevation. It does not compete with the existing architectural forms.
- 5.9 The proposed opening within the garden wall provides a glimpse of the garden and main facade beyond. The new entrance to the north provides a secondary entrance that resolves internal circulation issues, without making the other entrances redundant, nor superceding them in importance. The front facade is maintained in solid built form, the glazed wings sit delicately and symmetrically to either side of the Georgian architecture, reinforcing the main buildings importance, and being bound by recognisable landscape features on either side.
- 5.10 The proposed symmetrical glazed side additions seek to maximize garden connectivity and increase natural light into the existing house footprint whilst ensuring minimal visual impact on the site and surrounding area.
- 5.11 The new rear porch will provide a lightweight connection between the new brick extensions and the existing house. By retaining the existing garden wall to the rear of the new Reception Room (between the farmhouse and B6 Dwelling Annex/Converted Barn) and creating a new 'garden wall feel' to the west elevation - the new additions do not compete with the layout and architecture of the existing farmhouse and simply enhance the existing setting.
- 5.12 As a result, the proposals respond to the specific site conditions including the physical context, surrounding character and site constraints.

ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING CASE

- 5.13 In my view the proposed extensions will retain the principal elements of architectural significance to the farmhouse and will be visually subservient to the main building and rear extension. The set-back of the new structures will allow the main south-facing elevation to remain legible and the single storey construction, along with use of glazing, will reduce massing. The extensions therefore appear as appropriate and proportionate extensions to the original dwelling.
- 5.14 The proposal therefore clearly accords with Paragraphs 149 (c) and should properly be regarded as 'appropriate' development in the Green Belt. Similarly, I see no conflict with Development Plan policies GB1 and GB4.

IMPACT ON OPENNESS OF THE GREEN BELT AND PURPOSES OF INCLUDING LAND WITHIN THE GREEN BELT

- 5.15 Paragraph 138 of the NPPF states that a fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of the Green Belt being their openness and permanence.
- 5.16 In my view, for the reasons stated above and the in the supporting evidence within the Design and Access Statement, the proposed extension would not have any visual impact on the openness of the Green Belt given the size and depth of the extension relative to the original building. The careful design means the extensions will not be visible from any public vantage points, particularly the main transport routes to the east.
- 5.17 With respect to the five purposes of including land within the Green Belt set out in Paragraph 138 of the NPPF it is not considered that the proposals would conflict with any of these purposes.
- 5.18 As such the proposals accord with the NPPF and GB1 of the emerging Local Plan and GB4 of the 2005 Local Plan.

ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING CASE

DESIGN AND IMPACT ON CHARACTER OF THE AREA

- 5.19 Policy GP1 of the 2005 Local Plan requires development proposals to be of a layout, scale, mass, and design that is compatible with neighbouring buildings, spaces, and the character of the area, using appropriate building materials. Policy GB4 requires extensions in the Green Belt to not cause undue visual intrusion, to be appropriate in terms of design and materials and to be small scale compared to the original dwelling. Policy H7 requires that extensions have a design and materials that are sympathetic to the main dwelling and the locality of the development and that the design and scale are appropriate in relation to the main dwelling.
- 5.20 Emerging Local Plan Policy D1 relates to placemaking and sets out a series of design criteria for new development to adhere to so as not to cause damage to the character and quality of an area. Policy D11 relates to extensions to existing buildings and to achieve high quality design it states that proposals should respond positively in terms of local character, use of materials, detailing, scale, and proportion and positively contribute to the wider landscape.
- 5.21 The proposed extensions will retain the principal elements of architectural significance to the farmhouse and will be visually subservient to the main building and rear extension. The set-back of the new structures will allow the main south-facing elevation to remain legible and the single storey construction, along with use of glazing, will reduce massing. Whilst existing window openings at ground floor level within the gable ends of the house will be removed or altered these are likely later additions and impact upon the architectural character of the building will be minimal.
- 5.22 The extensions will sit below a retaining brick screen wall, existing to the east side of the house, and a new wall constructed to the west. The new wall will be in keeping with the character of existing boundary treatment to the foldyard and will visually balance existing walling to the east. The walling will not impact upon original boundary treatment and the drive access approach to the building group will be maintained. Subject to satisfactory material treatment, it is not considered that the new walling will impact upon the character of the farmhouse.

ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING CASE


- 5.23 Overall, it is considered that the proposed extensions will retain the architectural significance of the farmhouse and the principal elements which contribute to it. As such, no adverse impacts upon the retained heritage values of the buildings are assessed.
- 5.24 Similarly, the careful design will not be visible from any public vantage points and nestles comfortably within the existing built extent of the farmhouse and its associated cluster of buildings.
- 5.25 In all respects the design, appearance and materials of the proposed extension would be in keeping with the original dwelling and would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area. I conclude the proposal accords with Policies GB4, GP1 and H7 of the 2005 Local Plan, Policy D11 of the emerging Local Plan.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1 In relation to the principle of the development, the proposals accord with the policies of the Development Plan which facilitate house extensions within the Green Belt. The proposed extension has been carefully designed following a full contextual analysis and in my view is proportionate to and respectful of the original dwelling.
- 6.2 This proposal therefore clearly accords with Paragraph 149 (c) of the NPPF and should properly be regarded as 'appropriate' development in the Green Belt. Similarly, I see no conflict with Development Plan policies GB1 and GB4 as the proposal will clearly have no adverse impact on the reasons for including land within the Green Belt.
- 6.3 Turning to design and it is considered that the proposed extensions will retain the architectural significance of the farmhouse and the principal elements which contribute to it. As such, no adverse impacts upon the retained heritage values of the buildings are assessed.
- 6.4 Similarly, the careful design will not be visible from any public vantage points and nestles comfortably within the existing built extent of the farmhouse and its associated cluster of buildings.
- 6.5 In all respects the design, appearance and materials of the proposed extension would be in keeping with the original dwelling and would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area. I conclude the proposal accords with Policies GB4, GP1 and H7 of the 2005 Local Plan, Policy D11 of the emerging Local Plan. Planning permission should therefore be granted for this proposal.

Statement of Truth

"The evidence which I have prepared and provide for this Planning Statement is to the best of my knowledge true and has been prepared and is given in accordance with the guidance of my professional institution and I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions."

Signature:  Date: 9th September 2022.....
JAY EVERETT BSc HONS, MRTPI