



© Crown copyright and database rights [2013]  
Ordnance Survey [100018056]



**Rutland County Council**

Catmose,  
Oakham,  
Rutland  
LE15 6HP

Application:	<b>2022/0924/FUL</b>	<b>ITEM 5</b>	
Proposal:	<b>Extension to existing agricultural unit, including demolition of part of existing structure and new solar panels to roof.</b>		
Address:	<b>Barn at Manor House, Main Street, Ridlington</b>		
Applicant:	<b>Mr and Mrs Baines</b>	Parish	<b>Ridlington</b>
Agent:	<b>Mr Jason Edwards</b>	Ward	<b>Braunston and Martinsthorpe</b>
Reason for presenting to Committee:	<b>Applicant the son of Cllr Baines</b>		
Date of Committee:	<b>22 November 2022</b>		
Determination Date:	<b>10 October 2022</b>		
Agreed Extension of Time Date:	<b>25 November 2022</b>		

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**The proposal comprises the removal of part of the existing agricultural building, the erection of an extension and the siting of solar panels onto the roof. The proposals would be visually acceptable, would not be harmful to the identified heritage assets, would not be harmful to residential amenity or highway safety. The application is supported subject to conditions.**

## RECOMMENDATION

**APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions:

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

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

2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans:

2022/11 01B Location Plan  
2022/11 02C Proposed Block Plan, Elevations and Layout

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in accordance with Policies CS19 and CS22 of the Core Strategy, Policies SP15 and SP20 of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD.

3. Prior to any above ground development, the following shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall then take place in accordance with these approved details.

- Details of external wall materials/finished colours
- Details of external roofing materials/finished colour

Reason: To ensure that materials of an acceptable quality appropriate to the area are used and to accord with policies CS19 and CS22 of the Core Strategy and Policies SP15 and SP20 of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD.

4. If during development, contamination not previously identified, is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority, a Method Statement detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with. Development shall then take place only in accordance with these approved details.

REASON: To ensure that the development complies with approved details in the interests of the protection of human health and the environment and in accordance with Policy SP15 of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD.

## Site & Surroundings

1. The site is located to the north of Main Street with the dwelling occupying the eastern part of the site with a range of agricultural buildings further west. The agricultural buildings form a courtyard with the building the subject of this application forming the western section. The building comprises two elements, a breeze block pitched roof building with a corrugated roof and a corrugated lean-to element to the rear. There are further agricultural buildings to the east, a neighbouring property to the south and paddock to the west and north. The land levels fall northwards.

## Proposal

2. The proposal comprises the removal of the rear section of the building together with a replacement extension. This would match the depth of the existing to the west but would infill the north-west corner. The ridge height of the main building would be retained and the rear roofslope pitch would be altered to cover the existing rear portion of the building and the extension to the rear. The extension would be constructed of painted brick and metal sheeting for the walls and metal sheeting for the roof. Solar panels would be added onto the rear roofslope. The building would continue to be used for agricultural purposes.

## Relevant Planning History

There is no relevant planning history.

## Planning Guidance and Policy

### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019

Chapter 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development

Chapter 9 – Promoting Sustainable Transport

Chapter 12 – Achieving Well-Designed Places

Chapter 15 – Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

## Chapter 16 – Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

### **Site Allocations and Policies DPD (2014)**

SP5 - Built Development in the Towns and Villages

SP13 – Agricultural, Horticultural, Equestrian and Forestry Development

SP15 – Design and Amenity

SP19 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity Conservation

SP20 – The Historic Environment

### **Core Strategy DPD (2011)**

CS16 – The Rural Economy

CS19 – Promoting Good Design

CS21 – The Natural Environment

CS22 – The Historic and Cultural Environment

### **Neighbourhood Plan**

None

### **Other**

None

## **Officer Evaluation**

### Principle of Development

3. The proposal comprises the removal of part of the existing agricultural building, the erection of an extension and the siting of solar panels onto the rear roofslope. The existing building is in agricultural use and the proposed extension would not alter this.
4. The site is within the Planned Limits of Development and Policies CS16 and SP13 support agricultural development in principle. As such, no objection is raised to the principle of the proposals which accord with the thrust of the above policies. Policy SP13 relates to the visual impact, pollution, vehicular movements, and biodiversity; these are discussed below.

### Impact of the use on the character of the area

5. The Local Planning Authority is required to ensure 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,

through the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 at Section 72.

6. The Local Planning Authority is required to ensure that special regard is given to preserving the listed buildings and their settings in relation to Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the 'Act').
7. The NPPF refers to the importance of considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets. Policy CS22 of the Core Strategy and Policy SP20 of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD both seek to protect historic assets, their settings and their character and special features. Policy CS19 relates to design, Policy SP15 relates to design and amenity.
8. The site is within the conservation area, under the Article 4 Direction and Manor House is grade II, buildings to the south of the site are also grade II listed (Chimney Cottage and 1 Church Lane on the southern side of the highway) and St Mary and St Andrew's church (grade II\*) is to the south of the site.
9. The building is set back from the highway, with 15 Main Street intervening with the highway to the south. This part of Main Street is relatively built up with limited gaps between buildings providing glimpses of the countryside beyond. The application building is therefore not prominent from the highway and is glimpsed with 15 Main Street and its garage set in the foreground. As a result, although within the conservation area and with the listed Manor House to the east, the host building is not visually dominant or prominent from the public realm.
10. The building is of little architectural or historic merit and the extension to the rear is a low-lying structure; no objection is raised to the removal of this element. The extension would be of the same depth as the existing lean-to with the existing rear roofslope of the main building altered in pitch to cover the existing retained building and the proposed extension. The bulk and massing of the side and rear elevations would therefore be greater; however, the change would be marginal, and the appearance of the proposed extension would be an enhancement to the existing lean-to. The proposal would infill the northern corner of the building; this would add only a minimal amount to the building and views of this would largely be obscured from the public realm by the proposed rear extension. Furthermore, the land levels fall from the settlement which further reduces the visual impact of the proposal.
11. The proposal also comprises solar panels on the western roofslope. These would be set in from the side elevations, the eaves and ridge. This roofslope is not prominent, being set at an angle to the highway and public realm to the south with buildings intervening. Clear views of the rear elevation are not possible from the public realm. Furthermore, the solar panels would not be read on conjunction with Manor House with the panels not visible from the host dwelling.
12. Subject to a condition relating to external materials, it is not considered the proposal would be visually harmful. The proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and would not adversely affect the setting of any nearby listed building by reason of the limited nature of the proposals, the intervening development, and the separation distances.

13. The proposal accords with Sections 12 and 16 of the NPPF, Policies CS19 and CS22 of the Core Strategy, Policies SP15 and SP20 of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD and the above-mentioned Act.

#### Impact on the neighbouring properties

14. There are no neighbouring dwellings to the north or west and other agricultural buildings intervene to the east. 15 Main Street lies to the south and has a relatively shallow garden. However, the additional bulk and massing on the side elevation would be limited and the impact on the outlook from this property would be marginal. The additional footprint would be obscured from this property by the proposed extension to the rear which would occupy the same footprint as the existing. Given this, the separation distance, and the topography, it is not considered the proposal would be unduly harmful to the residential amenities of occupiers of that property.
15. The existing use of the building is agricultural, and this would remain the case with the proposed extension. This would have no greater impact on any nearby dwelling than the existing.
16. The proposal is therefore acceptable in this respect, in accordance with Section 12 of the NPPF (2021), Policy CS19 of the Rutland Core Strategy (2011), Policy SP15 of the Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (2014) and the Council's Extensions to Dwellings SPD (2015).

#### Highway issues

17. The proposal would not alter the existing access, parking or turning and the use of the building for agriculture would remain the same. The additional footprint would be limited and would not generate a significantly higher level of traffic than the existing. As such, the proposal would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on highway safety and the proposal would be in accordance with Section 9 of the NPPF (2021) and Policy SP15 of the Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (2014).

#### Ecology

18. Given the nature of the building, its construction, the large elements of open elevations, it is not considered there are protected species within the building. The proposal therefore complies with Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy and Policy SP21 of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD.

#### Crime and Disorder

19. It is considered that the proposal would not result in any significant crime and disorder implications.

#### Human Rights Implications

20. Articles 6 (Rights to fair decision making) and Article 8 (Right to private family life and home) of the Human Rights Act have been taken into account in making this recommendation. It is considered that no relevant Article of that act will be breached.

## **Consultations**

### 21. Highways

The Highway Authority's comments are based upon the supporting information submitted by the applicant. The Highway Authority has not been made aware of any departures from this information by the LPA that should be considered and as such the assessment of the proposal is provided against this context. The application proposes an extension to an existing agricultural unit. It is understood that access to the site is to remain unchanged as is the internal layout. The Highway Authority is satisfied that the proposal would not lead to any material detrimental impact upon the safety and efficiency of the public highway network. The internal site layout is considered to be adequate with sufficient space for the safe and efficient manoeuvring of vehicles. In line with the above the Highway Authority raises no objections to this proposal.

### 22. Public Protection

It is not anticipated that the site will be impacted by land contamination that may pose a risk to future users of the proposed development, therefore it is suggested a condition is applied if planning permission is granted.

### 23. Parish Council

No objection.

## **Neighbour Representations**

24. No comments received.

## **Conclusion**

25. Taking the above into account, it is considered that subject to the imposition of conditions the application is acceptable in principle, would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area or affect the setting of any listed building. There would be no harm to residential amenity, highway safety or ecology. The proposal is in accordance with Sections 9, 12, 15 and 16 of the NPPF, Policies CS16, CS19, CS21 and CS22 of the Core Strategy and Policies SP5, SP13, SP15, SP19 and SP20 of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD.