CASE OFFICER'S REPORT

Application Number: PL/2023/07494

Address: 57, EAST HATCH, TISBURY, SALISBURY, SP3 6PH

Proposal: Barn / store with adjacent hardstanding

Date of Inspection:
N/A
Consultation Expiry:
24/10/23
Press Advert: N/A

POLICIES
National Planning Policy Framework and the NPPG

Wiltshire Core Strategy
Core Policy 1: Settlement Strategy
Core Policy 2: Delivery Strategy
Core Policy 24: Spatial Strategy: Southern Wiltshire Community Area
Core Policy 51: Landscape
Core Policy 57: Ensuring high quality design and place shaping
Core Policy 61: Transport and Development

REPRESENTATIONS :

West Tisbury Parish Council – Support subject to conditions ensuring no commercial use and the barn be ancillary to 57, The Hatch only.

Highways – No objection

Third Party Comments **–** One objection letter received raising the following issues:

- Scale
- Suitability
- Potential impact upon residential amenities
- Drainage
- Light pollution
- Highways

PLANNING HISTORY

S/2004/2626 - BARN STABLE WITH ADJACENT HARDSTANDING – Approved, with conditions

Assessment

- Principle
- Scale, design and impact on the character and appearance of the area and AONB
- Impact on neighbouring amenity
- Highways and drainage

Scale, design and impact on the character and appearance of the area and AONB

Wiltshire Core Strategy Core Policy 57 states:

> *A high standard of design is required in all new developments, including extensions, alterations, and changes of use of existing buildings. Development is expected to create a strong sense of*

place through drawing on the local context and being complimentary to the locality. Applications for new development must be accompanied by appropriate information to demonstrate how the proposal will make a positive contribution to the character of Wiltshire….

The application site forms a section of land owned by 57, The Hatch, known as The Old Bakery and is situated in the small hamlet of East Hatch, West of Tisbury, and sits within the AONB.

The proposal seeks approval for a barn and hardstanding. The use of the agricultural barn will be as a field store, to include a small tractor, grass topper, trailer, hay bales, ladders, animal feed, and workshop. It is noted that a similar proposal was granted permission in 2004 for a barn/stables block located in the same position. Photographs have been provided illustrating that the footings of the outbuilding were begun, but never completed. The current proposal would be positioned upon the existing footprint with an altered design.

The overall principle of an ancillary outbuilding has been deemed acceptable due to the 2004 consent. The current proposal is considered to be of an appropriate scale and design for such a use with a simplified design from the previously approved scheme.

The outbuilding would be constructed in timber with corrugated roof, which is considered sympathetic to such a rural setting and appropriate for the proposed use. Concerns raised in regard to the suitability for such a building within this location has been noted. However, as a similar building has been granted permission, with the current design being more simplistic and the large area of land owned and maintained by the applicants such an outbuilding is considered common within such a setting.

The proposed barn would be stepped back from the boundary with the highway and is not considered to result in an overbearing or overly dominant structure which would be read in the context of the existing built form of properties within the hamlet. This, along with the principle of such an outbuilding having already been determined, it is not considered to pose a level of harm to the overall character and appearance of the area or the wider landscape of the AONB, which would warrant a refusal.

In addition, the concern raised in regard to potential light pollution upon the AONB have been noted. The applicant has confirmed that the barn would have internal lighting. The design does not incorporate any rooflights and therefore the light omitted would be contained within the building. Any external lighting would need to be applied for and ensure they complied with lighting regulations.

The position of the previously approved barn foundations is tucked away along the Western side of the field. A condition of the 2005 planning consent was that the hedge behind the proposed barn, and which runs along the highway, should remain high. Such a condition can be re-imposed to ensure the screening of the outbuilding along the perimeter of the site.

Its proposed scale and position ensure it would not be overly dominant from within the streetscene and proposed materials are considered appropriate for the setting and wider locality.

Therefore, the proposal is acceptable, and is considered to accord with the NPPF and Core Policy 51 and 57.

Impact upon Residential Amenities

Policy CP57 also states:

vii. Having regard to the compatibility of adjoining buildings and uses, the impact on the amenities of existing occupants, and ensuring that appropriate levels of amenity are achievable within the development itself, including the consideration of privacy, overshadowing; vibration; and pollution (such as light intrusion, noise, smoke, fumes, effluent, waste or litter)

Due to the position and orientation of the proposed garage and its openings in relation to any neighbouring properties it is not considered to pose any harm upon any residential amenities.

This was also the conclusion within the 2004 application and as the current barn would be positioned in the same location, the compliance to ensure residential amenities are upheld is maintained.

As suggested by third parties conditions can be imposed upon any approval to ensure the use remains ancillary to the main dwellinghouse only and cannot be used for commercial use.

Highways

The concerns raised in relation to the access/hard standing have been carefully considered. The applicant did confirm the following:

No new access or hardstanding is required. The entrance and track has been there for at least one hundred years, giving entrance to a small holding known as Cuffs. The ruins are still very much visible. When the 2005 consent was granted, the track was improved and brought up to the proposed barn for access in all weather.

The access and hardstanding was also deemed acceptable as part of the 2004 approval and there does not appear to be any alteration which would now be a reason for refusal.

The Councils Highways Officer was consulted on the proposal and provided the following comments:

I understand that planning permission was given for a similar scheme in 2004 and this scheme was started but not completed.

The existing vehicle access is proposed to be used to access the barn and it is not proposed to be altered as part of this application.

The hardstanding is proposed to be surfaced with scalpings but there is no mention of the access track being surfaced, I therefore assume this is to remain as existing and I wish to raise no highway objection.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to comply with Core Policy 61.

Drainage

Concerns have been raised in regard to drainage on site. It appears from the information submitted that the field access has been there for well over one hundred years and the proposed outbuilding would be positioned downhill of the highway.

Due to the existing footings being in situ and the proposed structure utilizing these the proposed building is not considered to pose any significant harm to the existing onsite situation.

In addition, the applicant has provided the following comments following the issues raised by third parties:

The barn is positioned downstream from the highway and would not discharge any additional water to the highway. As standard, there will be a soak away for any surface water from the barn.

Conclusion:

On balance, and when considering the previous approved scheme, the proposal is not considered to result in any harm upon the overall character and appearance of the area or negatively impact the wider landscape character of the AONB. It is positioned a suitable distance away from any residential properties and therefore, the application is considered to comply with CP51, CP57 and CP61 along with the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve, with conditions.