

Peter Hitchen Architects

Peter Hitchen Architects Ltd

Marathon House
The Sidings Business Park
Whalley
Lancashire
BB7 9SE
10 March 2023

**ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN STATEMENT TO SUPPORT THE RE-SUBMISSION FOR
PRIOR APPROVAL (SCHEDULE 2, PART 3, CLASS Q)**

**PROPOSED CONVERSION OF TWO AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS INTO
TWO DWELLINGS
LAND OFF WHITTLE HALL FARM, MOOR LANE, LANGHO**



View of the agricultural buildings from Moor Lane

Introduction

This statement is written to support the resubmission for prior approval following the refusal of the original application (ref 3/2023/0436) and the appeal decision (ref APP/T2350/W/22/3304870) to convert the two existing agricultural buildings into habitable use.

This resubmission is accompanied by the planning statement, location plan, existing and proposed site plans, floor plans, elevations and visuals.

A structural report and bat survey are also included within the documentation. In addition we include the letter from the land owner to provide supporting information regarding the land use and ownership particulars.

Existing site and buildings

The site is located off Moor Lane with direct access via an established track. There is a clearly defined existing curtilage to the site as defined on site by virtue of an existing timber post and rail fence.

Within the site area are three agricultural buildings (two former cattle sheds and a sheep shelter).

The proposal is to demolish the sheep shelter and retain the two cattle barns for their conversion into habitable use. For the purposes of this application the buildings have been titled as plot 1 and plot 2.

The site has a large expanse of concrete hardstanding. The two sheds are steel framed with the walls clad with vertical timber boarding and the roof finished with a cement fibre roof sheeting (plot 1) and metal sheeting (plot 2).

Both buildings are dual pitched with existing large openings to the gable ends and roof lights. They are low rise structures, adjacent to each other with their gables on a north west / south east axis.

The site is partially screened from the road by the existing woodland between Moor Lane and the site area. There is pasture land surrounding the site and it has far reaching views across the Ribble Valley.

A structural appraisal accompanies this statement which confirms the suitability and integrity of the primary structure of the buildings for conversion into two dwellings. The site is within flood zone 1 as it is located on raised ground off Moor Lane.

Plot 1

This building has a total floor area of 270 m² (existing) – 230 m² (proposed)

Plot 2

This building has a total floor area of 260 m² (existing) – 230 m² (proposed)

Conversion

The proposal is to create two single storey dwellings within the volume of the existing buildings. Both plots will require some partial demolition and removal of claddings. The plan arrangement ensures that the cumulative habitable floor area does not exceed 465 sqm. In order to achieve this the design demonstrates a reduced footprint to both plots within the shell of the buildings. Canopied areas enclose an external area within the footprint of the existing buildings. This will ensure the roof profile remains as existing to retain the simple profile.

Following the removal of the claddings the existing steel frame is to be fully exposed and cleaned. A coating of zinc primer will be applied to retain all of the primary structure.

The principle of the design is to retain the architectural simplicity of the buildings in order to ensure that they blend into the setting and have an agricultural aesthetic which reflects the rectangular arrangement of both buildings.

The mass of the buildings will remain the same and the elevational alterations are kept to a minimum with new and retained openings following the internal function of the spaces which have now been amended to address the inspectors comments (see later paragraphs)

The internal underground drainage and any services will be installed and the ground floor areas prepared to receive a damp proof membrane, new insulated floor screed.

The internal linings will consist of non structural insulated timber panels and metal framed suspended ceilings hung from the existing purlins. The linings will connect to the existing frame and a cavity will be retained between the linings and the proposed new external timber boarded cladding will be fixed to a plywood sheeting with membrane and counter battens.

The new windows will be aluminium powder coated frames and sit within recessed reveals within the external cladding.

The proposal includes a residential curtilage to demonstrate that the areas will not be larger than the floor areas of the individual plots (notwithstanding the shared access) and therefore conforms with the limits defined in Paragraph X of Schedule 2 Part 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.

It is the intention of the applicant to explore green solutions for the heating of the internal environment with ground source or air source to be considered.

The layouts demonstrate areas for plant of a sufficient size to accommodate the final solution. Site drainage will be taken to a soakaway installation for the surface water and a package treatment plant suitably sized for the accommodation.

Electric charging points will be located within the site for each plot.

Refer to the planning statement which highlights relevant matters from the appeal decision relating to the site location and existing building arrangement.

This statement summarises the design amendments which address the Planning Inspectorate comments with regard to the external appearance.

Three paragraphs from the inspectors report under the heading 'Design-Character and Appearance' relate to the fenestration and general external appearance as follows :-

13. The buildings are located alongside one another in a cluster that also includes a sheep shelter which is proposed to be demolished. Whilst there is a small wooded area between the building group and the road, the site is located on a hillside and is a highly exposed and conspicuous feature within the landscape. The buildings themselves are typical of modern agricultural design, comprising of vertically boarded walls and modern sheeted roofs with rooflights positioned centrally within each bay. Both have openings at either end with no openings in their side elevations. I saw several groupings of similar buildings nearby. Their utilitarian appearance is a characteristic feature of the surrounding landscape.

14. Whilst it is proposed to glaze the main openings on the north west elevation of the building at plot 1, the south east elevation would be completely reconfigured with a large open canopied section to one side as well as domestic proportioned openings. This elevation faces the road and is visible from the public right of way to the east. The proposed north east elevation facing the public right of way would feature three new openings of domestic proportions. The rooflights proposed would take a haphazard appearance and would not reflect the regimented positions of the existing rooflights.

15. Similarly, the building at plot 2 also features extensive reconfiguration of openings, with six new openings to the south west elevation. Neither gable would reflect the scale and position of their existing openings. There would be new openings to the north west gable and the provision of another canopied section to the opposing gable. As with plot 1, the rooflights would be haphazardly arranged on the roof and would not reflect the existing regular arrangement.

16. The extensive repositioning of openings, haphazard positioning of rooflights and the extent of new openings on elevations that are highly visible within the open countryside would erode the buildings' regimented and functional appearance. The development would therefore appear incongruous, which, given the highly exposed location, would adversely affect the landscape character. I accept that a degree of change would inevitably occur as part of the conversion works and this is reflected in the scope of building operations permitted by the GPDO. However, I am not convinced that the interventions need be as extensive as those proposed, particularly when having regard to the sensitive location of the buildings.

The proposal now demonstrates a reduction in glazing to the elevations to both the north west and south east elevations in order to assist with addressing the concern raised by the Inspector regarding the 'interventions' and will now reflect the existing rectangular arrangement.

We have also revised the roof window numbers and locations in order to eliminate any 'haphazard' configuration.

Protected species

The original application did not include a protected species survey and the inspectors report contained the following paragraphs regarding matters relating to protected species as follows :-

19. Bats and wild birds are protected by law² and their presence is a material consideration when a development proposal is being considered which would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat. There is a statutory duty on me to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity³. Paragraph 174 (d) of the Framework seeks to minimise impacts on, and provide net gains for, biodiversity.

20. The appellant has not provided a protected species survey. Furthermore, I have not been provided with any distribution records of bats in the locality. However, whilst the appeal site is exposed, it is very close to woodland and surrounded by open farmland. The adjacent trees could provide habitat for bats or nesting birds. The building at plot 1 is relatively open which could limit its potential for bats, however that at plot 2 is more enclosed and could provide nesting opportunities for birds or roosting opportunities for bats. Both buildings have exterior fascia boards, which could present crevice roosting opportunities.

21. In the absence of any survey information or bat records, I cannot be certain as to the extent to which protected species may be affected by the proposed development. Furthermore, if protected species were affected, I cannot be certain as to what mitigation, if appropriate, may be required.

22. In this regard, paragraph 180 of the Framework states that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.

23. For the above reasons, I cannot conclude that the proposal would not adversely affect protected species, specifically bats and nesting birds. The proposal would therefore conflict with paragraph 174 of the Framework described above and would fail to accord with the requirements of the GPDO in this regard.

This resubmission is accompanied by a protected species survey which will address all the aspects and any mitigation measures as necessary. The surveyor has thoroughly taken into account the inspectors comments.



View of the buildings from the north west (plot 1 to the left of the picture)



Plot 1



Plot 2



View looking down Moor Lane across the access



View looking up the access track towards Moor Lane