

has some local historic interest in its own right and can be considered a non-designated heritage asset due to its age, appearance and the survival of historic fabric, while it also provides legible evidence of the development of the historic farmstead over time. The surviving rustic character of the barn is a positive and enhancing element, within the setting of the Listed building and this character would need to be retained in any scheme for it to be considered acceptable.

The barn is currently empty and no longer in agricultural or stabling use and I would have no objection in principle to the conversion of the barn into a dwelling, which is likely to be its optimum viable use. The proposed scheme would see the conversion of the barn to form a two storey dwelling, with the central threshing area predominantly open to the roof space and galleried at first floor, with Bedrooms 1 and 2, both with ensuite bathrooms either side of the gallery. The single storey addition to the south of the barn, also timber built and of some antiquity, would be converted into a kitchen and living area. The single storey element to the east of the barn would be retained for car parking use.

In general, the proposed scheme is appropriate, with the potential to retain the plan form and historic fabric of the barn and **without significant new additions**. There are some areas of **surviving historic fabric** which would require particular consideration, **including the brick threshing floor**. This is a feature of historic interest and any works to provide a new floor slab would need to include the **careful removal** of the paving **bricks and their reinstatement**. Any new bricks required to replace lost or damaged bricks would need to match the existing and these could be approved by condition for a successful application.

In addition, there is a section of **surviving lath and plaster** on the western interior of the north midstrey. This is generally in fair condition, with some parts being loose. Lath and plaster is an unusual internal finish for a barn and this fabric **would need to be retained and repaired using a matching lime plaster, along with the weatherboarding** on its reverse, which was once the exterior finish of the midstrey.

Roof tiles, bricks and timber should be salvaged and reused as far as it is possible to do so. Any new fabric or materials such as **roof tiles would need to match the existing** and these could be approved by condition for a successful scheme. The barn is built of brick with a lime mortar and any repairs or repointing to brickwork should be carried out in matching materials. There are **two diaper-shaped vents within the west wall of the barn and consideration would need to be given to internal finishes**, to ensure that the brick fabric can continue to be appreciated. In addition, the existing materials are permeable which allows moisture to pass through the building's fabric, preventing damp. The introduction of non-permeable building materials and insulation during the conversion would therefore cause problems and would not be consistent with the conservation of the building. For example, the **introduction of a concrete floor slab would force ground moisture to the edges** of the slab, where it would be absorbed over time, by the permeable brickwork, resulting in damp and eventual decay. Materials such as lime mortar, lime plaster, limecrete, along with breathable membranes, timber sarking board, and permeable insulation (such as sheep wool and timber fibre board), would be appropriate.

The roof structure of the barn has been repaired with more minor elements, such as rafters and purlins apparently being replaced. However, the tie beams, wall plates and braces below the tie beams are historic **and their retention, along with other historic timbers would be necessary**. The scheme proposes the introduction of **six rooflights into the building**, which will reduce the need for new window openings. In general, I would have **no objections to this aspect of the scheme**. The fabric that would need to be removed does not appear to be historic. The four small skylights on the north pitch would not detract from the appearance of the building when viewed from the north. The skylights on the **southern roof pitch appear a little large in the drawings** and could potentially be relatively prominent. Views from the south allow an appreciation of the barn within the setting of the Listed building and

some reduction in size of the rooflights could be beneficial, if possible. All rooflights would need to be low profile and details could be approved by condition for a successful application.

The single storey southern element that is to become the kitchen and living area is of a fairly basic timber construction with a pantile roof, along with an area with a tin roof. The timber clad exterior of the kitchen area would need to be retained. Much of the timber structure is historic, particularly posts and beams, with some later elements added. Many historic timbers are quite crudely finished, and these would need to be retained, or reinstated, to preserve the functional and agricultural character of the building. The removal of an area of brickwork to facilitate access from the barn to the kitchen should be kept to the minimum necessary, but in general this is acceptable. A small link is proposed from this opening into the kitchen area, and I would have no objection to this in principle. It is shown as being predominantly glazed in the drawings and as an additional, modern feature and the only addition to the building proposed, this could be appropriate.

The replacement of the tin roofed area with slate would be acceptable. The open frontage of the kitchen/living room structure would allow large panes of glazing and the fenestration in this area would need to preserve this open aspect, although an overt contrast, resulting from an overly contemporary scheme would probably not be appropriate. The reuse of existing timber posts, along with the use of new oak posts where required, may be a suitable approach.

The glazing over of the large openings to the barn is acceptable. The glazing should be set back within the opening, in order to preserve their legibility. The opening to the south has no barn doors, while the doors to the opening to the north midstrey are present. Their reuse as shutters in the scheme, as shown in the drawings would also be beneficial. A glazed gable within the north midstrey to replace the existing weatherboarding would not be appropriate.

Consideration should also be given to hard and soft landscaping, external lighting, hard standing and boundary treatments. In general, elements should complement or enhance the character of the setting of the Listed building and refrain from over-domesticating the site. In addition, the introduction of external meter boxes, service pipes, air sourced heat pumps or other elements on the exterior of the building should be considered. Ventilation within the barn, particularly in bathroom areas will also require consideration. External vents should be inobtrusive and service routes would need to have a minimal impact. It is possible source roof vent tiles to blend in with the pantiles and elements such as external lights can be fitted in inconspicuous areas, such as below roof eaves.

In general, the scheme for the conversion of the building as outlined is appropriate. Care would need to be taken to ensure that the utilitarian and agricultural character of the building is not diminished or over domesticated. It is this rustic character that enhances the setting of the Listed building, and any scheme would need to adhere to Paragraph 206 of the NPPF, which states that new development within the setting of heritage assets, should enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.