

Application Number	14/0160/LBC	Agenda Item	
Date Received	12th February 2014	Officer	Mr Toby Williams
Target Date	9th April 2014		
Ward	Trumpington		
Site	Anstey Hall Farm Barns Grantchester Road Trumpington Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 9LH		
Proposal	Demolition of modern barn and outbuildings and removal of temporary structures to allow conversion of barns, cart sheds and stables to eight residential units and erection of four dwellings, the creation of a spur access drive from Anstey Hall Drive and associated works.		
Applicant	Hill Residential Ltd & Trumpington Investments Ltd		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: -The works to the listed and curtilage listed buildings would preserve their special interest.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site is Anstey Hall Farm barns, a collection of former agricultural buildings sited on the edge of Trumpington Village to the west of Anstey Hall and to the south of Anstey Farmhouse. The buildings on the application site are in use for domestic storage in association with the occupation of Anstey Hall. The storage includes cars, furniture and household items. The buildings are in various states of disrepair.

- 1.2 The buildings fall within Trumpington Conservation Area and form the western edge to the village. The tallest building is a former threshing barn of timber structure, weather-boarded on its sides with a pantile roof (formerly thatched). The barn is highly visible from Grantchester Road. It is referred to

throughout this report as Barn 1. It is listed Grade II and has a strikingly bold form and high ridge line. To the south of Barn 1 is a range of lower cart shed buildings of timber construction including a dovecote which is listed Grade II. Other buildings on the site are curtilage listed, mainly brick and form a series of enclosed yards apart from the southernmost barn, which is of modern construction and is divorced from the main group. The setting is rural, highly sensitive to change and represents one of the few remaining undeveloped former agricultural sites in Cambridge of heritage merit.

- 1.3 Anstey Hall Farmhouse to the north is grade II listed. The Farmhouse and its access are in residential use, are physically separated from the site and in different ownership. To the east, is the Church of St Mary and St Michael, a grade I listed building of high significance dating from the 14th century. The Church is surrounded by a grade II listed wall. The grounds and cemetery of the Church which adjoin the site are designated as Protected Open Space. To the east of the Church is the former Vicarage no.1 Grantchester Road, a grade II listed brick building in substantial grounds. To the east and south is Anstey Hall, a grade I listed building dating from the 18th century surrounded in part by a listed grade II garden wall and to the front by a grade II listed gateway not currently in use.
- 1.4 The site has a tree preservation order protecting a tree adjacent to the boundary with Anstey Hall Farm to the north, it falls outside the controlled parking zone and is entirely within the Green Belt and is also Protected Open Space and in an area of Best Landscape. The southern boundary of the site adjoins a tree belt which abuts the Trumpington Meadows housing development site, currently under construction. Across Grantchester Road to the north is a tree belt identified in the Local Plan of Local Nature Conservation Importance.
- 1.5 The site and its buildings can be appreciated in particular in views from the west with the Farmhouse and Church in view, from the south from the Trumpington Meadows site with the Church and Vicarage in view and from the Church itself. The on-set of Trumpington Meadows radically alters the setting of the site from the south, which is to be occupied by housing and a large linear country park running from the M11 in the south to the southern boundary of the site and which incorporates an area of allotments in close proximity to the western edge of the

site.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 Listed building consent is sought for the following:

- Demolition of a modern barn and outbuildings and removal of temporary structures
- The conversion of barns, cart sheds and stables to eight residential units (referred to as units 1-8) including extensions and alterations.
- The erection of four new dwellings (referred to as units 9-12. This element applies to the associated full application only)
- The creation of a spur access drive from Anstey Hall drive and associated works.

2.2 The retained converted farm buildings and the new buildings are arranged around a series of open courtyard spaces. Each residential unit would have its own separate private garden space. The spur access would run through a wooded area to the east and south of the Vicarage and the Church.

2.3 The application is accompanied by an associated application for full planning permission 14/0159/FUL reported separately to this Committee.

2.4 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design and Access Statement
2. Planning Statement
3. Heritage Statement
4. Sustainability Statement and Checklist
5. Site Investigation Report
6. Ecology Report
7. Tree Survey
8. Archaeological Assessment
9. Transport Statement
10. Foul Drainage Report
11. Structural Engineer's Report.

2.5 Amended plans and additional reports have been received which show the following revisions

1. Revised site layout plan
2. Barn 1, revised plans, elevations and sections
3. Barn 5, revised plans and elevations
4. Barn 7, revised plans and elevations
5. New build units: revised plans, elevations and site sections
6. Landscape, drainage and photovoltaic plans
7. Repair schedules for Barns 1 and 7
8. Traffic Survey Note
9. Highways Response to Objection
10. Reptile, Barn Owl and Badger Reports
11. Newt and Bat Survey Note Letter and further bat information

2.6 The amended plans have been re-consulted upon and the responses to the amendments are reported accordingly.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

C/64/0157	Replacement of thatch with natural pantiles for roofs of two barns.	A/C
C/71/0539	Construction of new access to Institute from Grantchester Road	A/C
C/89/0995	COU of farm buildings to leisure use	Withdrawn
C/89/0418	COU of farm buildings to workshops and offices	Withdrawn
C/91/0174 C/91/0175	CONVERSION OF FARM BUILDINGS TO RESIDENTIAL USE (22 SHORT TERM LETS)(AMENDED BY DRAWINGS and LETTER DATED 8TH APRIL 1991).	Ref
C/91/0954	COU of farm buildings to residential use (22 short term holiday lets) building 2 to office, barn (buildings 3 and 5) to games/ wet weather	A/C

	space	
C/91/0955	Repairs, alterations and extensions; rebuilding of barn 1 and demolition of buildings 12, 16, 19, 20 and extension of building 5	A/C
C/94/0301	New doors and cladding to two barns	A/C
C/94/0188 C/94/0189	NEW VEHICLE ACCESS AND PARKING FOR EXISTING HOUSE (C3) WITH NEW ACCESS ROAD RUNNING ALONG WESTERN BOUNDARY OF ST. MICHAELS PARTIAL DEMOLITION OF BOUNDARY WALL TO CREATE A NEW VEHICLE ACCESS.	Ref
C/94/0714/FUL	REFURBISHMENT OF EXISTING BUILDING AND CHANGE OF USE FROM AGRICULTURE (SUI GENERIS AGRICULTURE) TO STORAGE (B8).	Refused
C/04/0987 C/04/0988	Rebuilding of existing barn, construction of entrance hall and other" external alterations.	A/C
C/04/0499	Rebuilding of barn including construction of glazed link building and entrance hall.	Red
C/04/0526	Rebuilding of Grade II Listed Building including erection of new link building and entrance hall.	Ref
06/0140/FUL 06/0141/LBC	Erection of conservatory to rear of dwellinghouse.	A/C
C/07/1092/LBC C/07/1094/FUL	Forming an opening 6 metres wide with two new brick piers in wall on west boundary of Anstey Hall. (This connects the track from Anstey Hall to	A/C

	the farm buildings and has been implemented)	
10/0181/LBC 10/0180/FUL	Listed building consent to extend a vehicular driveway and new opening in boundary wall.	Refused Appeal dismissed
14/0875/CLUED	Application for a certificate of lawfulness under Section 191 for use of barn for domestic storage in association with Anstey Hall.	A/C

3.1 Although permitted, the 1991 application (C/91/0954) for holiday lets was not implemented.

3.2 The application for a new opening in the Anstey Hall listed wall under application 10/0181/LBC which was refused and dismissed at appeal is relevant. The appeal decision is attached to appendix 1 and its significance is discussed at paragraphs 8.31 - 8.35.

4.0 **PUBLICITY**

4.1 Advertisement: Yes
 Adjoining Owners: Yes
 Site Notice Displayed: Yes

5.0 **POLICY**

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/1 3/2 3/3 3/4 3/7 3/8 3/10 3/11 3/12 3/14 4/1 4/2 4/3 4/4 4/6 4/7 4/8 4/10 4/11 4/13 4/15

	<p>5/1 5/2 5/5 510</p> <p>8/2 8/3 8/4 8/6 8/10, 8/16</p> <p>9/5</p> <p>10/1</p> <p>I have not quoted all policies relevant to the Southern Fringe Development of Trumpington Meadows to the south as they are not of direct relevance.</p>
--	--

5.3 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

Central Government Guidance	<p>National Planning Policy Framework March 2012</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014</p> <p>Circular 11/95</p>
Supplementary Planning Guidance	<p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p> <p>Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)</p> <p>Public Art (January 2010)</p> <p>Sustainable Design and Construction (2007)</p>
Material Considerations	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001).</p>

	<p>Cambridge Landscape and Character Assessment (2003)</p> <p>Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy (2006)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy</p> <p>Balanced and Mixed Communities – A Good Practice Guide (2006)</p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p>
	<p><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2002)–Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan</p> <p>Trumpington Conservation Area Appraisal (2010)</p>

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan are of relevance. The area of land immediately to the west of the proposed retained barns and within the site is designated specifically as protected open space in the submission plan.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Urban Design and Conservation team

6.1 *Application as Submitted*

Summary

Not supported. It is not currently possible to conclude that the scheme is consistent with the character or appearance of the conservation area and the setting of the listed buildings.

The application has been the subject of extensive informal discussion and site visits with the applicants and agents.

Existing:

A very prominent site on the edge of Trumpington and its Conservation Area (CA); adjoining the grade I listed Church of St Mary & St Michael; the listed Vicarage; and connected to grade I listed Anstey Hall.

The site is important also for being the first bit of the settlement seen when approaching from the Grantchester direction, one of the few areas where real 'countryside' and farmland abut an historic village all but subsumed into the city and amongst the few farm buildings left within the city area.

The site also adjoins the former farmhouse (listed) and immediately adjacent buildings together along with the historic access onto Grantchester Road, now divided from and in different ownership to the rump of the farmyard.

Contains the Listed main barn and dovecote and unlisted but interesting older outbuildings nearby. Also, a mid-C20 'barn' of no architectural interest. There is also a mixture of older and

more modern boundaries within the site and much *in situ* concrete paving, overgrown areas and some decent trees.

The roofscape, in particular, is an extremely important feature, with the massive pitched tiled barn roof and the unusual half-hipped dove-cote roof being very noticeable.

Proposed:

Introduction

The site and the LBs, in particular, have been of concern for some years, having no obvious agricultural use, awkward access [the historic one having been sold off] and little repair & maintenance being carried out. The recent expansion of the village has brought new development close to the site but it remains visibly traditional in type & layout and a strong contrast to the suburban nature of much of the village. Clearly there are issues in terms of what sort of use is appropriate for the site and buildings and, from a conservation point of view, clearly some uses cause less need for alteration than others. However, getting a viable use that will provide the repairs and render the buildings watertight is vital for the buildings and an important concern. In particular, the need to bring the buildings – whether LBs or not – up to a habitable standard if residential use is chosen (as in this case) can be difficult to do in an acceptable manner.

Newbuild

With the exception of rebuilding of barn 7, the new units would be outside of the historical “envelope” of the farmyard. They would also not be consistent with the courtyard layout - eg the new elements of Units 5,6 & 8 would be attached additions outside the farmyards and units 9 – 12 fully detached from the farmyards. They are not therefore consistent with the established layout.

Units 9 – 12 would be major additions to the existing group in terms of height and building size. There is an existing hierarchy of size and “status” on and around the site from hall and church to vicarage and farmhouse to main barn and down to the smaller ancillary buildings of which most of the courtyards comprise. However, Units 9 – 12 would not fit into this aspect of

the character of the setting. They are tall, large and of demonstrative design.

There may be precedent on the site for a rebuilt substantial barn 7, but large buildings outside the farmyard envelope would be out of character with the nature of the group and setting.

The effect of the new-build units on the roofscape of the group is not illustrated in the submitted material but their proximity to existing buildings and scale is in itself enough to indicate significant impact.

If the new-build units deemed to be justified the conservation questions are: Are they in the right location? Are the designs appropriate? In broad terms the layout seems to work in creating another “farmyard” enclosure and something of a formalising way into the whole complex where vehicles & pedestrians come to the centre and then peel off to the various dwellings.

The positioning is slightly awkward in that the gable end of Unit 11 [North elevation] is the first thing that visitors to the site would see after passing through the main opening in the wall. The juxtaposition of different but similar materials could look slightly muddled or overly complex. The roofs are tall and together with the size of the buildings mean the new build dwellings would compete with the Listed original farmhouse and main barn as the heart and *raison d’etre* of the whole historic complex. The facades look rather too ‘busy’ in terms of the ‘modern’ panelling systems criticised elsewhere on barn conversions but could be acceptable here. It would be worthwhile seeing real examples on other sites, if possible.

If new build (in say a tighter and scaled down form) was acceptable for the scheme as a whole, then this end of the site is probably the right location, however its scale, and relationship with the existing farmyard need reconsideration.

Demolitions

The demolition of the ‘modern’, more industrial-type barn is acceptable. There are also piecemeal demolitions to create amenity space or to allow buildings to be linked, etc. and these will be discussed individually below. However, the Structural

Engineer's report notes that one building remnant Barn 7 / Units 7 & 8] is dangerous and unlikely to be sound enough to be 'converted' but could be dismantled and the historic elements salvaged and rebuilt but in a form suitable for habitation.

Conversions

Detailed and extensive notes regarding the merits of the individual proposals for the conversions are provided. The comments highlight the need for further survey and repair schedules for barns 1 and 7 and amendments to some of the elevations of the barns to reduce the extent of glazing or amend its size or location. Raises questions regarding the type of vertical timber treatment and glazing for some of the units, the use of timber bollards and screens proposed for the subdivision of the yards and some of the linked extensions for units 6 and 8.

Access and garden wall

This is an important boundary wall to the many LBs around it and is curtilage Listed. This is contentious as a similar application was refused not that long ago; an Appeal was unsuccessful. The changed circumstances are that there is now a real purpose to the driveway and to the opening in the wall. They provide the only realistic means of access to the barns [the Listed ones, in particular] and, hence, give the site a potential future where these LBs are more likely to be repaired & maintained in good order. The demolition of the minor outbuilding is unfortunate but getting an acceptable route through the trees rather inhibits choice. If the remaining outbuilding, the wall and such like can be repaired as part of the creation of the opening, then this is probably a tolerable loss, given the balancing gains elsewhere on the site.

Conclusion:

There is qualified support for bringing the existing buildings into use but there is a lack of information, on important aspects as described above and the new-build components are inconsistent with policy 4/10 and 4/11.

Application as Amended

These further comments relate to the proposals as amended by revised drawings and repairs schedules.

These comments relate to the documents submitted as “Repair schedules – revised incorporating engineer’s comments” June 2014. In previous comments, we considered that the lack of detailed information about the realistic possibility of converting the main barns on the site prevented full support.

The information now provided goes a long way to illustrating both more detailed inspection and discussion of the existing construction and condition of Barns 1 & 7 as well as more detailed explanation of how repairs and alterations are proposed to be undertaken.

The agents, Cowper Griffith, have fairly recently undertaken a large barn conversion project at Stowe [landscape gardens in Buckinghamshire] for the National Trust and this has been visited to see the finished result. Some of the techniques proposed here have been demonstrated there and some of the design details for the lesser outbuildings at Anstey Hall Farm are similar to those seen at Stowe.

BARN 1

The revised report now provides more of the information required to make a detailed assessment of the Listed Building (LB). However, there remains the significant difficulty of the structural stability of the building. Therefore a LBC condition is required.

Similarly, at various places in the "*Barn 1 Repair schedule*" with respect to the roof are references e.g. "to engineers details" for various works. The details are not available at this stage and in order to ensure that they are compatible with the character of the listed building, these would need to be covered by a LBC condition.

A number of other, more minor issues are raised and a Method Statement to explain how the replacement is to take place without threatening the structural stability of the LB will be required.

BARN 7

Similarly to Barn 1, the revised report for this barn improves the level of information available but with differences that reflect the current condition of the different barns. While being of considerable age Barn 7 has been much altered and some of its character degraded.

The report now assesses the many cracks and other structural failures and poor repairs / alterations and suggests methods of repair or removal and replacement for each. This now provides a sound basis for putting what is essentially a shell into a condition where it can be added to and converted into dwellings. It does not seek to address the question raised about whether splitting the building into two dwellings is the optimum way of treating it.

Building Recording

With respect to barns 1 and 7 in particular require a building recording condition

NEW BUILD HOUSES

We note the revised plans reduction in scale and number of the new build elements. The new build units having been reduced in scale are considered to now no longer challenge the scale of the main barn.

Previous comments on the new units being outside of the historical “envelope” of the farmyard remain a concern. Units 9 – 10 in particular seem hard to justify.

If new build is acceptable for the scheme as a whole, then at least this end of the site is probably the right location and creating another “farmyard” enclosure is appropriate.

Before any new build elements were occupied, works to the listed buildings should be completed.

Revised Conclusion:

Support remains for the general intent of the scheme and the two main buildings have now been better surveyed and assessed from a repair point of view.

We note the revised plans reduction in scale and number of the new build elements. The new build units having been reduced in scale are considered to now no longer challenge the scale of the main barn. The justification for the amount of new-build remains unclear.

Some significant matters (e.g. the issue of the leaning/bowing in Barn 1) remain and as noted above, need to be resolved via Conditions.

English Heritage

- 6.2 No objection to the principle of development. The proposals as formally submitted are contextually appropriate in this highly sensitive location within the Conservation Area. On balance, the conversion proposals would not cause substantial harm to the significance of the grade II listed barns and would bring them back into beneficial use. The overall scheme would not cause harm to the setting of several highly significant heritage assets including the grade I listed St Mary and St Michael Church and Anstey Hall or the character and appearance of the Trumpington Conservation Area. The proposals are in accordance with the NPPF.
- 6.3 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received specifically in relation to the listed building application. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file and its associated partner application 14/0159/FUL.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:
- 1 Grantchester Road
 - 3 Grantchester Road

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Green Belt

- The proposal is contrary to Green Belt policy.
- Other alternative uses should be explored which are less harmful to the Green Belt
- The site is not previously developed land.
- Previously demolished buildings should not be taken into account
- The proposal would merge Trumpington Meadows with the site.

Access and Transport Statement

- The access arrangements are inadequate, too narrow between gates with limited or no pathway at times outside the entrance from Maris Lane with pedestrians having to use the road.
- The proposal will result in conflict and highway safety issues with users of the nearby nursery.
- Transport Statement is inaccurate and surveys have not been carried out at peak times. The number of car parking spaces is 38 not 27.
- Access should be from near the barns onto Grantchester Road or through Trumpington Meadows which would have better sight lines.
- The traffic survey was carried out during the school holidays of certain schools which high levels of vehicle commuting.
- The trip levels are an underestimation.
- Occupiers are unlikely to walk or cycle from the site.

Impact on the Listed Buildings and Conservation Area

- The intensification of the use of the access would adversely affect the Conservation Area
- The four new dwellings would harm the heritage significance of surrounding listed buildings.
- A widening of the access to 4.5m would be of detriment to the character and appearance of the area
- The access route would be of detriment to the setting of 1 Grantchester Road, a grade II listed building and the Church, a grade I listed building.

History

-Appeal history for 10/0180/FUL demonstrates that there is no justification for making a break in the listed wall. History for C/0188/94 demonstrates that the reasons for rejection apply to an access to the east of the wall.

Amenity

- The boundary of 1 Grantchester Road will be less secure and make it easier for people to access
- Increase in noise levels associated with the use of the access by vehicles and particularly the rumble strip (10m from the boundary).
- Light industrial uses would have less of an impact, especially at weekends.
- Users of the Church and the graveyard are likely to suffer disturbance.

Other

- Commercial venture
- Impact of construction vehicles on the listed wall and trees
- The application proposes changes in height to listed wall not in control of the applicants
- The application should not be determined until the ecological surveys have been undertaken. It will have a negative impact on wildlife
- The proposal is a gated development and would not promote social cohesion
- The existing foul water drainage system running under 1 Grantchester Road is insufficient to cater for the increased demand from the converted barns.
- The public consultation summary is misleading.

7.3 Cambridge Past Present and Future have made a representation, which is summarised as follows:

- The proposals for the demolition, conversion and new build are welcomed.
- The layout and proposed materials would retain a sense of a working farmyard through their limited subdivision.
- The new build accommodation is at the perimeter of the yard forming a distinctive grouping away from historic structures.

-Planting should be native and the belt to the south of the site adjacent to Trumpington Meadows should be reinforced.

-They have a remaining concern regarding the suitability of the access for the number of dwellings proposed but recognise that it negates the need for an additional opening from Maris Lane or Grantchester Road.

- 7.4 A petition has been received from 43 signatories. The petition sets out an objection to the application on the following basis:

'We feel that the provision of access/exit at Anstey Hall for vehicles associated with 12 properties on the Anstey Hall Farm Barns site will make the already very congested, Maris Lane/Church Lane/Grantchester Road junction very dangerous for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians (including those wishing to drop off and pick up at the nursery), especially at peak times in the morning and evening when a lot of traffic is likely to leave/enter the new development in connection with work/school run etc.

A Development Control Forum was not requested as part of the petition.

- 7.5 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Context of site, design and external spaces
2. Other Issues

Context of site, design and external spaces

Context

- 8.2 This is a very prominent and important site on the edge of Trumpington and its Conservation Area, adjoining the grade II listed Farmhouse, the grade I listed Church of St Mary & St

Michael, the grade II listed Vicarage (no.1 Grantchester Road; and connected to the grade I listed Anstey Hall.

- 8.3 The site is important for being the first bit of the settlement seen when approaching from the Grantchester direction, one of the few areas where real 'countryside' and farmland abut the historic village. The roofscape, in particular, is an extremely important feature, with the massive pitched tiled barn roof and the unusual half-hipped dovecote roof being very noticeable.
- 8.4 The Principal Conservation Officer notes in his response that the site and the listed buildings, in particular, have been of concern for some years, having no obvious agricultural use, awkward access (the historic one having been sold off) and little repair & maintenance being carried out. The recent expansion of the village has brought new development close to the site but it remains visibly traditional in type & layout and a strong contrast to the suburban nature of much of the village.

Layout and Context

- 8.5 The proposed layout comprises 8 converted and extended barns and four new dwellings within the south eastern corner of the site. Access is from the east via the Anstey Hall driveway. The first appreciation of the site is from the eastern approach where the end gables of the new dwellings (units 10 and 11) would be appreciated. The access then swings round into the centre of the site and a series of open, mainly hard surfaced courtyards are created for parking and access, with minimal vertical division of space.
- 8.6 In my view, the proposed open layout preserves a visual connection between the converted buildings and the sense of a working farmyard. I have no concerns regarding the positioning of the new dwellings in this regard, they complement the character and feel of the farmyard style spaces and clearly define the entrance to the site.
- 8.7 I note that the Conservation Officer still has some concern with regard to the positioning of the new units in terms of their relationship with the converted buildings, being outside the historical 'envelope'. This is not a concern shared by English Heritage or myself. Whilst the new dwellings are the first view of the site from the eastern approach, this is a private view and not

as important as views from the west. If the principle of the new build is acceptable, in my opinion this is the best place for it. The new build does not interfere with the key public view of the site from Grantchester Road and is positioned appropriately and sensitively so as to allow the creation of landscaping and green buffer zones to the south and the west of the buildings. The legibility of the site is improved and the new build is contextually appropriate if technically outside the historical 'envelope' of the converted building.

- 8.8 I accept that there may be views of the new build units from the Church, from the Vicarage and from Trumpington Meadows to the south. In particular, the tower of the Church and the span of units 11 and 12 may be seen in the same view, albeit softened by intervening landscaping. However, I consider the contextual relationship appropriate, both in terms of the design of the new units, their height and their distance from neighbouring listed buildings. They are of a distinctive design, of high quality and relate well, not only to the existing farmyard grouping but also the listed buildings to the north and east.

Landscape

- 8.9 Each of the 12 dwellings proposed have a decent proportion of private garden space associated with them. The garden spaces are not unduly prominent and have been well thought through so as to minimise the domestication of the barns and their surrounding curtilages. The meadow to the west of units 1, 2 and 3, which face onto Grantchester Road, will not be used for private garden space but will be retained as an open grassland space and managed by a management company. The private spaces for units 1, 2 and 3 are a series of courtyards on their eastern sides. Condition 20 of the application for planning permission seeks to remove any permitted development rights from being exercised regarding the use of the meadow on the western and southern sides as private garden.
- 8.10 Similarly, the south side of the site will incorporate additional planting and a SuDS detention basin. The setting of this side of the site, with the removal of the modern agricultural barn, will be greatly improved.
- 8.11 Within the site a combination of high quality hard surfacing materials, including cobbled feature paving, oak screening,

permeable paving and brick walling is proposed. This helps to break down the various spaces and subtly define ownership boundaries. The landscaping treatment has the support of the Council's Landscape Officer and in my view is entirely appropriate.

Scale

- 8.12 The new build units comprise two pairs of long and narrow 4 bedroom properties with accommodation on two floors. They would be 7.5m wide and 6.9m high with a series of interestingly shaped ventilation cowls extending higher to 7.3m. The body of the units has been broken down into a steeper pitched element housing the main accommodation and a subservient shallower pitched element extending from it.
- 8.13 The revised plans have reduced the height of the new build elements. Cross-sections have now been provided which show a lower height to the retained Unit 7 which has a substantial roof form. The Conservation Officer's no longer considers the scale of the new build to challenge the scale of the main barn. I agree with this assessment.
- 8.14 I have no concerns with the scale of the majority of the additions to the converted barns. These are all single storey.
- 8.15 Units 7 and 8 are within a substantial brick barn. The roof is not original and the proposal seeks to recreate the original roof shape. The ridge therefore rises from 5.5m to 8.7m. I have no concerns with this aspect of the proposal as it more accurately reflects the historical height and importance of the building within the family of farm buildings on site.

Design and Finish

- 8.16 The new build units are designed as contemporary dwellings which reference the form of the converted barns and buildings. The external skin of the units is constructed from vertical batten oak cladding, soft red brickwork and a standing seam zinc roof. PV panels are to be inserted on the shallower roof slopes.
- 8.17 The approach to the finish for the converted units is to make minimal changes to the external fabric, however, where interventions are required, the use of vertical oak battens

positioned in front of glazed elements is used, together with simple glazed links, roof-lights and the use of existing openings where possible. Conservation officers have provided very detailed notes on the acceptability of the various finishes and for units 1 and 7 in particular. Revisions have been undertaken to accommodate those concerns.

- 8.18 The agents, Cowper Griffith, have recently undertaken a large barn conversion project at Stowe, Buckinghamshire, for the National Trust and this has been visited to see the finished result. Some of the techniques proposed here have been demonstrated there, such as the vertical oak cladding with recessed glazing behind, and some of the design details, for the lesser outbuildings at Anstey Hall Farm are similar to those seen at Stowe. This has re-assured officers that the design interventions and finishes are broadly acceptable subject to various conditions.

Demolitions

- 8.19 The demolition of the 'modern', more industrial-type barn is acceptable. There are also piecemeal demolitions to create amenity space or to allow buildings to be linked. Further structural surveys have been carried out by the applicants in relation to Barns 1 and 7 following concerns raised by the Principal Conservation Officer that not enough detail had been provided. Subject to conditions, the Principal Conservation Officer is satisfied that sufficient survey information has been submitted to support in principle the grant of planning permission and listed building consent.

Access and garden wall

- 8.20 The Principal Conservation Officer assesses this is an 'important boundary wall to the many LBs around it and is curtilage Listed' and that the proposal to partly demolish a section of it as 'contentious as a similar application was refused not that long ago' to allow for the easier movement of garden machinery. A following appeal was unsuccessful and the Inspector's Decision letter is attached as appendix 1 to this report.
- 8.21 I note the concerns raised by the Inspector in the appeal decision regarding the excessive width and unnecessary impact

of the loss of part of the curtilage listed wall to facilitate the proposed access and the 5m + width of the new driveway on the approach to and setting of Anstey Hall. Issues concerning harm to the division between the wooded area and the parkland to the south by creating the gap were raised together with the dominance of the width of the new driveway. There is little difference between the dimensions of what is now proposed compared to the previous scheme and I understand that there has not been a historical connection with the ownership/management of the farm and its buildings and Anstey Hall.

8.22 However, the circumstances and need for the break in the Edwardian wall have changed. There is now a real purpose to the driveway and to the opening.

8.23 My view and that of the Conservation Officer, is that the access point and the necessary demolition of part of the wall provides the only realistic means of access to the barns. Other access points have been explored by the applicants but have not proven feasible and are outside of their control/ownership. Whilst I recognise that harm would result from the demolition of the wall and the creation of the spur on the setting of Anstey Hall, this is outweighed by the conversion of the barns and their bringing back into active managed use where they are more likely to be repaired & maintained in good order.

8.24 To my mind, despite the third party representation, the appeal dismissal should not be seen as an absolute obstacle to the proposed access point given that the Inspector was not considering the benefits of a scheme for the re-use of the barns against the harm identified. Conditions attached to this listed building consent seek to ensure that the remaining outbuilding and the wall are repaired as part of the creation of the opening.

Option for Use of the Barns

8.25 Different types of use provide different pressures on the use of listed buildings. From a conservation point of view, some uses cause less need for alteration than others. However, getting a viable use that will provide the repairs and water-tightness that are vital for the buildings is an important concern. In particular, the need to bring the buildings – whether LBs or not – up to a

habitable standard if residential use is chosen (as in this case) can be difficult to do in an acceptable manner.

8.26 The applicants set out in their planning statement that the residential use of the barns is the most appropriate use and that other potential uses were considered, including agricultural, storage, community and commercial uses. The Design and Access Statement includes an appraisal of the options for the uses.

8.27 I accept the appraisal and also that a commercial office use may be equally acceptable from a conservation point of view. However, the applicants have put in detailed plans which demonstrate that the conversion to residential, particularly for Barn 1, but also the Dovecot and Barn 7 is acceptable and will result in minimal harm to the special interest of the buildings. This has been backed up by detailed survey work. This view is supported by English Heritage and following the amended plans, subject to conditions, the Council's Urban Design and Conservation Team support the detail of the proposed conversions.

Summary

8.28 The proposed context of the site is highly sensitive and the plans have been subject to considerable scrutiny. My view is that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the rural character of the edge of this part of Trumpington would be enhanced by the proposal. As such, the setting and special interest of the farm buildings would be preserved and the setting of adjacent listed buildings would be preserved. The proposal would result in some harm, such as the removal of part of the listed wall and creation of an access spur to identified heritage assets. My view is that this harm has been minimised, is less than substantial and is outweighed by the sensitive conversion and desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of the heritage assets and putting them into viable uses consistent with their conversion. The proposal complies with Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/2, 3/3, 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/11, 3/12, 3/14, 4/2, 4/3, 4/10 and 4/11 and accords with paragraphs 126 to 141 of the NPPF 2012.

Other Issues

8.29 Third party representations raised in respect of this application are discussed in detail under the application for full planning permission 14/0159/FUL.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The heritage impacts of the scheme and the residential use of the barns are acceptable including: the new build; the individual conversions to the former farm buildings; the access; and partial demolition of the wall. In these respects, the scheme has the support of both the Council's Principal Conservation Officer and English Heritage.

9.2 The proposal has been well thought out and will deliver a very high quality residential conversion and extension of the existing farm buildings. The new build will relate well to the conversions and will appear of a contemporary and distinctive form befitting the site. I recommend that consent be granted.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to:

-the completion of the s106 Agreement

-the completion of additional bat survey work and the agreement of any necessary mitigation measures with the Council's Nature Conservation Project Officer.

-the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. Prior to the commencement of works to the Listed Barn 1 or to the part of the listed wall to be demolished to make way for the access, a method statement for the correction or stabilisation of the outward lean noted in the "Barn 1 Repair schedule - Revised Incorporating Engineers Comments - June 2014" and a method statement for the repair of the listed wall and its associated building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any such works shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved method statement.

Reason: In accordance with Local Plan Policy 4/10 and as Listed Building Consent is granted for conversion of the standing barn not for rebuilding or dismantling. No structural works shall be carried out to Listed Barn 1 or new elements inserted unless drawn details have previously been submitted to and approved by the LPA.

3. The new-build houses shall not be occupied until the Listed Buildings have been fully repaired to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In accordance with Cambridge Local Plan Policy 4/10 and to ensure that structural works are compatible with the character of the listed building.

4. No work to commence until the working drawings relating to the conversion have co-ordinated Building Regulations & Listed Building requirements into one coherent scheme following a Building Regulations approval for the conversion which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: to avoid adverse impacts on the character and special interest of the listed building in accordance with Local Plan Policy 4/10.

5. No brickwork is to be erected until the choice of brick, bond, mortar mix design and pointing technique have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority by means of sample panels prepared on site. The approved panels are to be retained on site for the duration of the works for comparative purposes, and development must take place only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

6. The method and specific system for any cleaning of masonry, timberwork and/or other materials is to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA [any form of blast cleaning is unlikely to be approved]. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless the LPA agrees to any variation in writing.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Listed Building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

7. Full details of all new / repaired / reinstated render including mix design, surface finish, substrates, etc. to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless the LPA agrees to any variation in writing.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

8. Full details of all repairs to the historic timber frame [including replacement timber, new / replacement joints, pegs, plates, etc.] shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Timber repairs shall thereafter be undertaken only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

9. Full details of the new structural components including metalwork (columns, beams, etc.), timberwork and the fire protection cladding systems are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless the LPA agrees to any variation in writing.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Listed Building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

10. No new, replacement or altered joinery shall be installed, nor existing historic joinery removed, until drawings at a scale of 1:10 of all such joinery (doors and surrounds, windows and frames, sills, skirtings, dado rails, staircases and balustrades, etc.) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

11. Prior to any painting/varnishing/staining or other external treatment to new or retained joinery, the colour of the external treatment to new or retained joinery shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority by means of the British Standard Number [obtainable from B S Framework for Colour Co-ordination for building purposes, BS 5252: 1976]. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

12. Samples of timber boarding are to be submitted to the LPA for approval for type, fixing method, surface [sawn, planed, etc.] and surface finish [paint or stain] or self-colour. Boarding and finishing shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

13. No roofs shall be constructed until full details of the type and source of roof covering materials and the ridge, eaves and hip details, if appropriate, have been submitted to the local planning authority as samples and approved in writing. Roofs shall thereafter be constructed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

14. A Method Statement describing the type of underpinning to be used shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. This should detail the means of excavation, spoil disposal [particularly if window frames, etc. have to be removed to allow material out or plant in], concrete placement, protection of historic fabric & features, removal & reinstatement of historic floor finishes, moisture drainage systems, etc..

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Listed Building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

15. Full details of all mass flooring systems [concrete, limecrete, compacted earth, etc.] including waterproofing, junctions with walls, textures, colours and finishes are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless the LPA agrees to any variation in writing.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Listed Building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

16. No rooflights shall be installed until full details of rooflights have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Rooflights which stand proud of the plane of the roof are unlikely to be approved. Rooflights shall thereafter be installed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Listed Building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

17. Full details of the glazed screen, framing, louvres, etc. to the Southern gable end to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless the LPA agrees to any variation in writing.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Listed Building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

18. Full details of the glass type(s) to be used in windows/doors/screens/roofs or other glazed features to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. It may be necessary to submit samples to discharge this Condition. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless the LPA agrees to any variation in writing.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Listed Building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

19. Full details of the kitchen / study free-standing 'pod' and the free-standing stove to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless the LPA agrees to any variation in writing.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Listed Building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

20. No boiler flues, soil pipes, waste pipes or air extract trunking, etc. shall be installed until the means of providing egress for all such items from the new or altered bathrooms, kitchens and plant rooms has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Flues, pipes and trunking, etc. shall be installed thereafter only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Listed Building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

21. Where new/modern partitions are to be inserted into the historic building, fixings shall be installed in the least damaging way and with the fewest number [compatible with structural stability] to walls, floors & ceilings. Installation should be wholly reversible and allow for making good if partitions are later removed. Full details of such partitions are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless the LPA agrees to any variation in writing.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Listed Building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

22. Full details of the means of temporary restraint / stabilisation / support to the retained historic fabric [walls, roofs, etc.] during the works to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Thereafter the temporary measures shall be installed in accordance with the agreed details [unless the LPA agrees to any variation in writing] until such time that the historic fabric is capable of self-support.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Listed Building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

INFORMATIVES

1. Listed Building Consent is granted for conversion of the listed barn 1 not for rebuilding. The consent does not extend to dismantling of the frame or roof.
2. Glass types that are tinted, metallic coated, mirrored or are otherwise rendered non-transparent are unlikely to be agreed.
3. The 'barn doors' on the Western elevation are specifically included in the requirements for condition discharge.

2. Unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson of this Committee to extend the period for completion of the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development, if the Obligation has not been completed by 5 November 2014, or if Committee determine that the application be refused against officer recommendation of approval, it is recommended that the application be refused for the following reason(s):

The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, transport mitigation measures, public art, waste facilities, waste management and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/5, 5/14, 8/3 and 10/1, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan (Core Strategy Development Plan Document July 2011) policy CS16 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, the Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010, the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation

2010, the Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan 2002, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012.

3. In the event that the application is refused, and an Appeal is lodged against the decision to refuse this application, delegated authority is sought to allow officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development