

## Allerdale Borough Council

### Planning Application FUL/2021/0058

#### Development Panel Report

**Reference Number:** FUL/2021/0058  
**Valid Date:** 23/02/2021  
**Location:** Old Joiner's Workshop, Croft View, Westnewton, Wigton, CA7 3PQ  
**Applicant:** Mr P Bewick  
**Proposal:** Change of use of former joiner's workshop to dwelling (resubmission of FUL/2020/0158)

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Refuse permission

#### 1.0 **Summary**

<b><u>Issue</u></b>	<b><u>Conclusion</u></b>
<b>Principle of Development</b>	Lies within the infill/rounding off village (as defined by policy S3 of the Local Plan Part 1) of Westnewton where development is acceptable in principle (subject to policy S5 criteria).
<b>Residential Amenity</b>	No issues with residential amenity for neighbours or future occupiers. Condition would be required to secure joint amenity space with Croft View.
<b>Highway safety</b>	No change to access. Condition would be required to secure joint parking with Croft View.
<b>Design</b>	Minor alterations to fenestration acceptable. Harmful increase in scale with prominent band of new stone around wall head.
<b>Heritage</b>	The building is a non-designated heritage asset. Increase in scale has negative impact on identity and legibility of original use. The band of new stone around wall head would be prominent; there is substantial harm to the

	significance of both the conservation area (its appearance will not be preserved) and the non-designated heritage asset of the building itself.
--	---

## 2.0 **Proposal**

- 2.1 The application is for full planning permission for the change of use of the former Joinery workshop into a two bedroom dwelling. The footprint of the building will not change. It is proposed to increase the height of the building by approximately 45cm to provide for floor to ceiling heights. This will be achieved by building up the wall head around the whole building using old sandstone.
- 2.2 There will be a number of alterations to the openings on the building as follows:
- a) on the front elevation, the sliding metal panel will be replaced with vertical timber cladding and a vertical window to fill the opening. At first floor level the opening will be moved to a central location and changed from a wooden door to window.
  - b) on the south west facing elevation, the openings will be kept the same width. They will be slightly altered in height at first floor level to accommodate higher wall heads. At ground floor level, the door will be replaced with a window and the bricked up openings restored to glazed windows. At first floor, the boarded up opening will be transformed into a mixed timber cladding/window, and the two windows will be maintained. A skylight is to be added onto the roof slope.
  - c) the rear elevation has no openings and no alterations are proposed besides the increase in height.
  - d) the north east side elevation keeps the existing door and adds an additional door onto the rear amenity area.

### 2.3 The Plans for consideration are:-

01001 Rev 01 Existing Plans  
02001 Rev 01 Existing Elevations  
04004 Rev 01 Site Block Plan  
04002 Rev 01 Location Plan  
04001 Rev 05 Proposed Plans  
05001 Rev 01 Proposed Elevations  
06001 Rev 03 Proposed Section

The suite of documents can be viewed here;-

<https://allerdalebc.force.com/pr/s/planning-application/a3X3X000004DWGVUA4/ful20210058>

### **3.0 Site**

- 3.1 The Old Joinery is located within the village of Westnewton. Its front elevation opens out onto the road through the village.
- 3.2 The building is a traditional, sandstone workshop with a pitched, slate roof. The application red line is drawn around the old joinery building and a single storey store/utility room to the rear. The blue line shows that the buildings are within the same ownership of the neighbouring residential property, Croft View, its rear amenity space and parking area. The joinery appears to be linked to Croft View with an internal yard. The joinery is a 1.5 storey building and is subservient in scale to the neighbouring dwelling.
- 3.3 The building is currently vacant and it is understood that it has not been in use for several years. It is structurally sound but in need of maintenance, particularly to the roof.

### **4.0 Relevant Planning History**

- 4.1 FUL/2020/0158: Change of use of former joiner's workshop into a two bed dwelling. Withdrawn 4<sup>th</sup> February 2021.

### **5.0 Representations**

#### **Parish Council**

- 5.1 No comments received.

#### **ABC Environmental Health**

- 5.2 No objection. Comments requiring conditions regarding protection of amenity and long term protection of future occupants.

#### **Cumbria County Highways/LLFA**

- 5.3 Requested further details to show parking layout. No further comments.

#### **Natural England**

- 5.4 No comment.

#### **County Fire Service**

- 5.5 No objection.

## **Other representations**

- 5.6 The application has been advertised by press advert, site notice and neighbour letter.
- 5.7 No letters of objection have been received.
- 5.8 One letter of support has been received and addresses the following:
- a) building looking forlorn and would make ideal home;
  - b) proposal would contribute to vitality of village;
  - c) visual impact limited and beneficial.

## **6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment**

- 6.1 With reference to The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the development is not within Schedule 1 nor 2 and, as such, is not EIA development.

## **7.0 Duties**

- 7.1 The site within a designated conservation area? Section 72(1) of the Listed Buildings Act 1990 states that, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

## **8.0 Development Plan Policies**

### **Allerdale Local Plan (Part 1)**

- 8.1 The following policies are considered relevant;-

Policy S1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development

Policy S2 – Sustainable development principles

Policy S3 – Spatial Strategy and Growth

Policy S4 – Design principles

Policy S5 – Development principles

Policy S7 – A mixed and balanced Housing Market

Policy S27 - Heritage Assets

Policy S29 – Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage

Policy S30 – Re-use of land

Policy S32 – Safeguarding Amenity

Policy S33 – Landscape

Policy S35 – Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Policy S36 – Air Water and Soil Quality

Policy DM14 – Standards of Good Design  
Policy DM15 – Extensions and Alterations to existing Buildings

These policies can be found here:-

<https://www.allerdale.gov.uk/en/planning-building-control/planning-policy/local-plan-part-1/>

## **Allerdale Borough Local Plan (Part 2)**

- 8.2 Westnewton is an infill/rounding off village as defined by policy S3 of the Part 1 policy. There are no defined settlement boundaries in the Part 2 Local Plan for this village.

The Plan can be found here:-

<https://www.allerdale.gov.uk/en/siteallocations/>

## **9.0 Other material considerations**

### **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019)**

- 9.1 Paragraph 184 states that “heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value<sup>61</sup>. These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.”
- 9.2 Paragraph 193 advises that “When 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 (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.”
- 9.3 Paragraph 195 advises that, where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:
- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
  - b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and

d) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and

d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

9.4 Paragraph 196 states that, where a development proposal will lead to 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, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. Paragraph 197 continues by advising that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

9.5 Paragraph 212 advises that the policies in this Framework are material considerations which should be taken into account in dealing with applications from the day of its publication. Paragraph 213 advises that existing development plan policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of the NPPF. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

#### **Westnewton Conservation Area Appraisal (2008)**

9.6 The Conservation Area Appraisal includes defining features and management policies for Westnewton and was agreed at Development Panel in 2009. Some relevant points include:

- a) The Old Joinery is identified as a building which contributes positively to the character and historic importance of the conservation area;
- b) The building is pictured as a typical sandstone outbuilding.
- c) Predominant walling material is red sandstone. Render is unusual.
- d) A key characteristic is a high proportion of traditional buildings retaining their original characteristics of simple rectangular forms, pitched roofs, chimneys, and rectangular window openings set vertically.
- e) A negative characteristic is modernisation using render which should normally be stopped.
- f) Croft View has a formal frontage and stands forward, providing a visual 'stop' to the main street and to the road entering from Aspatria.

## **The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3 (2nd Edition)**

- 9.7 This publication produced by Historic England is used as a framework to inform the assessment of the impact of developments on the setting of heritage assets, including listed buildings. It is therefore a tool applied for the assessment against policy S27 of the Local Plan Part 1 and the built heritage advice contained with the NPPF. The document can be accessed on line here;-

<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/>

### **10.0 Policy weighting**

- 10.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that, if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This means that the Allerdale Local Plan (Part 1) 2014 and Allerdale Local Plan (Part 2) policies have primacy.
- 10.2 There are no material considerations in this instance which would result in a decision being made contrary to the development plan. The NPPF is afforded weight as a material consideration but policy S27 in particular is considered to have a high degree of consistency with the NPPF.

### **11.0 Assessment**

#### **Principle of development**

- 11.1 Policy S3 of the Local Plan (Part 1) identifies Westnewton as an Infill/Rounding off Village. The application site lies within the Westnewton Settlement Boundary. Policy S3 seeks to locate development within the settlements identified to a scale commensurate with the size of the settlement. One dwelling is commensurate in scale. Therefore, the principle of an additional residential dwelling in this location is acceptable.
- 11.2 The building is vacant and has been unused for many years. There are no concerns relating to the loss of any employment use.

#### **Residential Amenity**

- 11.3 Policy S32 safeguards residential amenity. The building is located within a village and it is considered that a new dwelling would be compatible with surrounding uses. It is located close to Croft View with an adjoining yard. There are no windows on the interfacing side elevations so there would be no overlooking issues between the two buildings. The increase in height of the

Old Joinery would not be overbearing or impact daylight/sunlight levels to the neighbouring dwelling.

- 11.4 The Old Joinery is within the same ownership as Croft View. Whilst the Old Joinery has no amenity space of its own, the applicant proposes that the occupiers will benefit from the large amenity space of Croft View. Should planning permission be granted, officers would seek to secure this link by condition.

### **Highways**

- 11.5 Policy S5 requires development to include acceptable arrangements for car parking and access. There will be no alterations to highways and there is no outside space included within the red line. The neighbouring dwelling at Croft View is within the same ownership and currently has space for five cars to park safely. Should it be decided to grant planning permission then it is considered that a condition could be drafted to ensure that the Old Joinery parking requirement is secured within this shared space which already has established access.

### **Design**

- 11.6 Policy S4 sets out that achieving high quality design is a key objective. Policy DM15 requires a high standard of design for alterations to existing buildings.
- 11.7 The proposals to the windows are minor and overall the replacement of boards and restoration of original openings that have been bricked up will be positive.
- 11.8 The key change externally is the raising of the building height through the addition of approximately 45cm of red sandstone to the wall head all around the building. It is proposed that the pitch of the roof remains approximately the same as existing. The resulting height of the building will still be lower than the neighbouring property at Croft View and it will still appear subservient in scale. However, as set out in the heritage section below, the increase in scale is considered to significantly compromise the historic and architectural integrity of the building. It is understood that the building is capable of conversion and beneficial reuse at ground floor level without the alterations to the roof.
- 11.9 Officers are also concerned about the design detail in relation to the building itself, specifically the introduction of a band of new material at the wall head. This is considered in full in the next section regarding heritage assets.

### **Heritage**

- 11.10 Policy S27 seeks to ensure that the historic environment including all heritage assets and their settings will be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their intrinsic historic value and significance, their importance to

local character, distinctiveness and sense of place, and to other social, cultural economic or environmental benefits/values.

- 11.11 In determining applications that could affect the significance (including character, appearance, historic value, value to people and setting) of a heritage asset, Policy S27 requires the following factors to be taken into account:
- a) The level of significance of the heritage asset(s).
  - b) The impact of the proposal on the significance (including setting) of the heritage asset(s).
  - c) How the significance and/or setting of the asset could be better revealed.
  - d) Opportunities for mitigating climate change without damaging significance.
- 11.12 Only proposals which do not harm any positive qualities of the heritage asset(s) will be approved, unless there is a clear and convincing public benefit to the proposal that will outweigh the harm caused to the asset(s).
- 11.13 The Old Joinery is not listed and does not lie within the setting of any listed buildings. However, officers consider that the building constitutes a non-designated heritage asset. The significance of the historic value of this heritage asset therefore relates to its design and proportions as an ancillary curtilage outbuilding to the house. Its historic and architectural identity, appearance and character (similar to barn conversions in the open countryside) is reflected in the existing proportions of the existing building, which would be lost in the increase of the height of the building
- 11.14 Furthermore, the building lies within the Westnewton Conservation Area and is identified by the Appraisal as a building that contributes positively to the character and historic importance of the conservation area. As an outbuilding to Croft View, it assists in the forming an end point to the village. It is prominent in views from the village to the east, and on the approach to the village from Aspatria.
- 11.15 In addition to issues with scale, the increase in height of the roof is of concern because the materials would introduce a new strip of sandstone around the top of the walls. The applicant has suggested that old sandstone could be sourced which would be weathered and more likely to match the existing stone, than new red sandstone. However, whilst noting this comment, officers respectfully opine that matching is unlikely and, with such a prominent building that contributes so significantly to the character and appearance of the conservation area, there are clear and overriding concerns that the additions would be incongruously noticeable. This is due to the character and patina of the existing stonework. Conditions, including a sample panel, could not secure the desired and required match. The resultant harm would be of a magnitude that the character and appearance of the conservation area would neither be preserved nor enhanced. The qualities of the building as a non-designated heritage asset would also be irrevocably lost.

11.16 Officers have considered alternatives, but the conservation area appraisal is clear that render is inappropriate within the village and red sandstone is characteristic of the village.

## **12.0 Balance and Conclusions**

12.1 The proposal has been considered against the provisions of the development plan as a whole. There is accordance with some elements of the Plan, noticeably policy S3 of Part 1 of the Local Plan. It is also accepted that, subject to conditions, there is accordance with policy S32 in terms of residential amenity impact and S22 in relation to highway safety. A small degree of weight can also be afforded to the delivery of one additional dwelling recognising the minor contribution it would make to the Council's overall housing supply. This is a benefit, albeit not a public benefit of any meaningful weight in the overall balance. There are also no issues in terms of loss of an employment use, it is clear that the building cannot sustain such a use now and hasn't for a significant period of time.

12.2 However, there is conflict with policy S27 when informed by the provisions of the NPPF. There is harm to the significance of both a designated heritage asset (the conservation area) and a non-designated heritage asset (the buildings), of a degree considered to be less than substantial, but veering towards being substantial. The harm arises firstly from the proposed increase in scale compromising the historic and architectural integrity of the building and its legibility as a former, historic forge, subservient to other buildings. This is compounded by the proposed introduction of a band of new material around the wall head which, due to the character and patina of the existing stonework, will be noticeable. Conditions, including a sample panel, could not secure the desired and required match. The level of harm is considered to not be outweighed by public benefits or, indeed, any other considerations in this case.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**Refuse permission for the following reason:--**

- 1. There is a degree of harm resulting from the proposal which, although less than substantial, is such that the character and appearance of the designated conservation area will neither be preserved nor enhanced. This is as a result of the proposed increase in the height of the building which currently is prominent and contributes significantly as a non-designated heritage asset landmark within the designated conservation area, the building's historic use being clearly legible from its form and design. The harm is compounded by the introduction of the band of new material around the wall head. The harm is not outweighed by any public benefits or other material considerations and results in an overriding conflict with policy S27 of the Allerdale Local Plan Part 1 (2014).**

