ITEM NO: Location: Calders Cottage, Putteridge Park, Luton, LU2 8LB

Applicant: Mr R Langeveld

Proposal: Timber clad barn

Ref. No: 17/01214/ 1

Officer: John Chapman

Date of expiry of statutory period: 20 July 2017

Reason for Delay (if applicable)

Seeking further clarification from applicant and Committee cycle

## Reason for Referral to Committee (if applicable)

Officer recommendation contrary to that of a statutory consultee.

# 1.0 Relevant History

- 1.1 Permission granted for the erection of a 5 bedroom replacement dwelling following the demolition of the existing house and garage and the retention of the current residential use of the garden area as delineated on the submitted plans (app no 11/00979/1HH). This permission was subject to a condition which removed Class A & E "permitted development " rights, and although a subsequent appeal was lodged against the above condition this appeal was dismissed.
- 1.2 Permission granted for two and single storey side extension, insertion of dormer windows to front roof slope, side conservatory. Detached double garage and retention of summerhouse (app no 12/01054/1HH).
- 1.3 Permission granted for two and single storey side extension, insertion of dormer windows to front roof slope, side conservatory; detached double garage (app no 12/01694/1HH).
- 1.4 Permission granted for the erection of a timber stable block with tack room and covered hay store within the paddock area to the south west of the residential curtilage (app no 15/00417/1).
- 1.5 Permission granted for a timber gazebo in rear garden (app no 16/01089/1HH).

### 2.0 Policies

## 2.1 North Hertfordshire District Local Plan No.2 with Alterations

Policy 2 - Green Belt

Policy 19 - Historic Parks and Gardens

### 2.2 National Planning Policy Framework

Section 7 - Requiring good design

Section 9 - Protecting Green Belt land.

Section 11 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Section 12 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

# 2.3 Emerging Local Plan 2011-2031 (Approved by Full Council 11th April 2017).

Policy SP5 - Countryside and Green Belt.

Policy NE1 - Landscape

Policy HE1 - Designated heritage assets.

## 3.0 Representations

3.1 Offley Parish Council - no comments received.

### 3.2 **Hertfordshire Gardens Trust** - initially commented as follows:

"Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of The Gardens Trust, has commented on applications on this site which is within the HE Registered Putteridge Bury parkland. Since 2011, the house has been enlarged twice, a garage and a stable block added and a 'gazebo' installed. The addition of a timber barn to an already overcrowded section of the open parkland further reduces the significance of the parkland and the accumulated clutter of buildings is not consonant with historic design.

We therefore consider that this application should be refused. "

Following the response above they later wrote and commented as follows:

"HGT object in principle to the building of this barn. It is outside the immediate curtilage of the house and therefore extending the built area of the park. This are of the park has been cluttered with ancillary buildings and extension s over the past few years so the cumulative effect of designed parkland has been harmed and its significance diminished.

However, we do have a number of concerns about the design should it be granted planning permission

- 1. Why does it need insulated roof panels if it is merely for equipment? It suggests that a residential change of use may be a future planning application
- 2. If it is an agricultural/equestrian building in a rural area then we object strongly to black metal panels. These will cause glare in strong sunlight and should be replaced by oak shingles or clay tiles to match surrounding buildings.
- 3. Timber cladding is acceptable in a rural building of this nature. We are unclear why it needs to be black
- 4. It seems out of scale with other buildings at the Cottage, being much larger in area. This does not appear strictly necessary given the use proposed in this application. The roof design also appears to be inappropriate for rural bran, being more industrial in character compared to the usual pitched roof. The use of a roller shutter is far too industrial for such a rural building, especially as it is not on a working farm.

If permission is minded to be granted we would propose that a more appropriate design and materials be required and a more modest scale."

# 4.0 Planning Considerations

## 4.1 Site & Surroundings

4.1.1 The application site is located along a single width track which leads south from the main estate road and serves this property and Mangrove Lodge. To the north west of the proposed barn is Calders Cottage, which is a white rendered property above a brick plinth with a grey tiled roof. Beyond the north, south and east boundaries of the residential curtilage is a paddock area, which is bounded along its northern and eastern boundaries by a line of trees which screens the site from longer views from these directions. To the east of the paddock area is an open field, as there is beyond the track opposite the house. The stables and tack room granted under the planning permission referred to at paragraph 1.4 are sited alongside the western

boundary of the paddock area. The application site is situated within the East of Luton Green Belt and also forms part of the Putteridgebury Registered Park and Garden of special historic interest.

# 4.2 **Proposal**

4.2.1 This application seeks permission for a timber clad barn with a black metal roof, within the paddock area associated with Calders Cottage, which would measure 12 metres in width and depth and have a maximum height of 4 metres. The barn would be located to the south east of the residential curtilage of the dwelling and, as set out in the application forms, would be used for the storage of agricultural and equestrian equipment that is used on the paddock land and for family vehicles.

### 4.3 **Key Issues**

- 4.3.1 The key issues to the determination of this application relate to the acceptability of the proposed development in terms of Green Belt policy and its impact upon the Historic Park and Garden, having regard to advice set out at Sections 9 & 12 of the NPPF.
- 4.3.2 With regard to the first issue since the proposed development would be used for the storage of agricultural and equestrian equipment I consider that it does not constitute "inappropriate development " within the Green Belt, having regard to the first and second bullet points of paragraph 89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, given the height and floor area of the proposed barn I do not consider that the overall openness of the Green Belt would be compromised by this proposal.
- 4.3.3 Turning to the second issue I was sympathetic with the concerns raised by the Hertfordshire Gardens Trust and therefore advised the applicant of their objection and subsequent comments to this application. A copy of the appellants response is attached as Appendix 1 of this report.
- 4.3.4 On balance, I am persuaded by the applicants arguments. In reaching this view I have taken into account the limited area from within the Historic Park and Garden from which this building would be viewed. This part of the park is somewhat divorced from the main historic area, which is centred on the main house and grounds of Putteridgebury and Home Farm Court (extending to their vehicular access routes off the A505 and Putteridge Road) together with the public footpath leading to Lilley Bottom and agricultural land to the north.
- 4.3.5 In my opinion the conversion of the previous agricultural buildings at Home Farm Court, the soon to be provision of school playing fields between Old Hayes Wood and Home Farm, the planting of trees along the northern and western boundaries of the applicant's paddock land, together with the selling off of homes with their own curtilage and paddock land has all contributed toward the dilution of the overall landscape character and appearance of the Historic Park, thereby creating the sub-division of land which once formed a whole. As a result I do not consider the siting or appearance of this building, which as stated above is not seen in the overall context of the main part of the Historic Park and Garden, would cause harm to its overall landscape character and appearance, so as to justify the refusal of planning permission in this instance. Furthermore, in the event that members agree with the later comments made by the Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, insofar as the proposed materials are concerned, this could be dealt with by a suitably worded condition which would require that (notwithstanding the submitted details) materials should be subsequently agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

# 4.4 Conclusion

4.4.1 Whilst it may be argued that the proposed barn could be of a more traditional design (and as a consequence allow the use of tiles or replica slates for the roof material, as opposed to the black metal roof proposed), for the reasons set out

above, I consider that the proposed building is acceptable in terms of its impact upon the overall character and appearance of the Historic Park and Garden.

### 5.0 Legal Implications

In making decisions on applications submitted under the Town and Country Planning legislation, the Council is required to have regard to the provisions of the development plan and to any other material considerations. The decision must be in accordance with the plan unless the material considerations indicate otherwise. Where the decision is to refuse or restrictive conditions are attached, the applicant has a right of appeal against the decision.

## 6.0 Recommendation

- 6.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:
  - 1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the details specified in the application and supporting approved documents and plans listed above.

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with details which form the basis of this grant of permission.

#### **Proactive Statement**

Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. Discussion with the applicant to seek an acceptable solution was not necessary in this instance. The Council has therefore acted proactively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.