

Planning Statement (incorporating Heritage statement)

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION OF EXISTING
BARN/STABLES BUILDING AT:

SWEETAPPLES BARN, SILLEN LANE, MARTIN, FORDINGBRIDGE SP6 3LF

October 2023

Prepared by Jerry Davies



Image: Courtesy Google Earth

1.0 Introduction & Background

- 1.1 This statement is submitted in support of an application to demolish an existing stables/barn building within the curtilage of Sweetapples Barn, Martin.
- 1.2 The building in question is used for incidental storage purposes in connection with the occupation of Sweetapples Barn as a dwelling. It comprises an open fronted section into which some loose boxes have been installed, along with an enclosed section which contains household items such as gardening machinery and equipment.
- 1.3 The applicant wishes to remove the building in order to re-landscape the area to the east of Sweetapples Barn, thereby improving its setting and outlook. The building is of contemporary construction and materials. It is understood from anecdotal evidence that a barn was first constructed here in the 1930s/1940s but that this was replaced when Sweetapples Barn itself was converted into a dwelling in the early 1990's pursuant to a planning permission granted in 1988 under reference 86/33441.
- 1.4 The materials used in the building are all consistent with this. It has a concrete floor and the open part of the barn is supported on rolled steel joists set vertically into concrete saddles. The roof and cladding to the rear and sides is galvanised corrugated steel sheeting, with all of the structural timberwork being treated softwood. The cladding to the enclosed bay at the front of part of the building is stained timber weatherboarding. At the rear the building is set off a wall that forms the common boundary with the adjoining property Kings Farmhouse - this boundary wall itself is to be retained.

2.0 Procedure

- 2.1 The building is not listed and is not considered to be curtilage listed, and this applies to Sweetapples Barn as well. Sweetapples Barn was, as mentioned above, converted into a dwelling in the 1990's and was not considered to be curtilage listed at that time – it was formerly part of Kings Farm. Sweetapples is a thatched cottage to the north of the site and is listed, however the proposed works do not affect that property or any of its boundaries. Likewise there is a listed barn to the north-east which lies within the yard at Kings Farm but Kings Farmhouse itself is not listed.
- 2.2 Consequently, it is not considered that listed building consent is required. The building lies within the conservation area and therefore its demolition is considered to be development and 'relevant demolition', meaning that planning permission is required and the demolition cannot be 'permitted development' under Part 11 of the GPDO 2015.

3.0 Planning Considerations

- 3.1 As explained above, the building has no architectural or historic interest and dates from the early 1990's. It is constructed from simple, contemporary materials and whilst it is largely inoffensive it does occupy quite a large footprint. The applicant intends to landscape this area once the building is demolished – whilst those landscaping works are

yet to be finalised it is not anticipated that they would involve any new 'development' and would be primarily comprised of planting and surface treatment of the space revealed.

- 3.2 The building is relatively straightforward to demolish and 'dismantling' would perhaps be a better description of the operation itself. It is proposed to remove the cladding and then disassemble the structural timber frame, remove the loose box installations and remove the concrete staddles and vertical steel joists. As mentioned above the party boundary wall with Kings Farmhouse would be retained as it is.
- 3.3 The removal of the building would serve to reduce the amount of built form on the site and to that extent it would bring about a small improvement to the character and appearance of the area. In any event there is no legitimate planning reason why the removal of the building should not be permitted.

4.0 Planning Policy

- 4.1 At both the national and local level, planning policy and guidance is aimed at preventing unnecessary harm to heritage assets. In this case, the conservation area itself is a designated heritage asset but the building to be removed is not, for the reasons explained above. The removal of the building would not cause harm to the conservation area – on the contrary, as a functional building of modern construction its removal would likely have a small but positive effect on the character and appearance of the conservation area. Indeed as paragraph 207 of the NPPF notes...*not all elements of a Conservation Area or World Heritage Site will necessarily contribute to its significance.*
- 4.2 Paragraph 194 of the NPPF states: *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 assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.* This exercise has been carried out above – it is clear that the building cannot be considered as a heritage asset in itself.
- 4.3 In terms of local planning policy, policy ENV3 of the Local Plan Part 1 deals with design quality and local distinctiveness. It is again aimed at controlling the impact of new buildings and uses rather than the removal of buildings, but it does state that development should be... *sympathetic to its environment and context, respecting and enhancing local distinctiveness, character and identity...* It is also clear that a key aim is to...*enhance the sense of place by ensuring that buildings, streets and spaces are attractive to look at through good architecture, landscape and street design.* Removing a building or structure that is of no intrinsic character or value can plainly have a positive effect upon a conservation area.
- 4.4 Policy DM1 of the Local Plan Part 2 deals specifically with heritage and conservation and like policy ENV3 is primarily geared towards assessing the effect on heritage assets of new buildings and uses or indeed assessing the removal of genuine heritage assets rather than, as in this case, the removal of building of no heritage value. Nonetheless it states that proposals...*should conserve and seek to enhance the historic environment and heritage assets, with particular regard to local character, setting, management and the historic*

significance and context of heritage assets. For the reasons explained above it is considered that the removal of the building in question would make a small but positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

5.0 Conclusion

- 5.1 The building itself holds no heritage value and its removal is not considered to raise any legitimate planning objections. On the contrary the removal of this large, contemporary and somewhat utilitarian structure would, if anything, bring about a small but positive improvement to the character and appearance of the area, reducing the built footprint of the site and allowing for the creation of a landscaped space.
- 5.2 It is therefore submitted that planning permission can be granted for the development. It is not considered that any conditions (other than the standard time limit) are necessary in the circumstances.