

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P13/V0556/FUL</a>
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	FULL APPLICATION
<b>REGISTERED</b>	22 March 2013
<b>PARISH</b>	PUSEY
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Anthony Hayward
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr Matthew Green
<b>SITE</b>	Pusey Lodge Farm House Pusey Lodge Farm Pusey Oxfordshire SN7 8QD
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Erection of replacement dwelling, demolition of existing modern barn and reversion of existing sub- divided farmhouse to single dwelling
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	None
<b>GRID REFERENCE</b>	437321/196571
<b>OFFICER</b>	Mark Doodes

---

1.0 **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 The barn to be demolished is modern and not of traditional construction. It is located on the application site, and adjoins the original garden to the farmhouse. The farmhouse is a grade II listed building currently used as two separate dwellings. The group of buildings at Pusey Lodge Farm consists mainly of former agricultural buildings recently converted to residential use. Just south is Cherbury Camp, a marsh fort, which is a scheduled ancient monument.

1.2 The group of buildings is in an isolated location in open countryside at the end of a long narrow track, 1.25 miles from A420, 1.1m from Pusey and about 4 miles from both Stanford in the Vale and Kingston Bagpuize. The site location plan is **attached** at **appendix 1**.

1.3 This application is being brought to committee because Pusey Parish Meeting supports it and the officer recommendation is to refuse permission.

2.0 **PROPOSAL**

2.1 The application is for the demolition of a large agricultural barn and the construction of a four bedroom home with a floor area of 404 sq metres arranged over two floors along with associated parking and landscaping. The application also proposes the reversion of the listed farmhouse from two separate units (as established by a recent certificate of lawfulness) into a single dwelling. Of significance is that both the proposed demolition works and the reversion works to the farmhouse do not require planning permission, only listed building consent, in the case of the latter.

2.2 A copy of the application plans is **attached** in **appendix 2**.

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 Pusey Parish Meeting – “*Unreservedly support this application*”

3.2 County Highways Officer - No objection.

3.3 Conservation Officer – Supports the removal of the barn, supports the reinstatement of the farmhouse as a single dwelling and supports the design aesthetic of the new dwelling.

3.4 Waste Management team – No objection.

3.5 Four neighbour letters have been received supporting the application and one neighbour letter has been received raising no objections. All comments focus on the benefits of the proposed removal of the agricultural barn and the restoration of the listed building to a single dwelling.

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 [P13/V0447/LDE](#) - Approved (19/04/2013)

The use of the former farm house as two separate dwellings.

4.2 [P12/V2495/LB](#) - Approved (15/03/2013)

Internal alterations to listed building and demolition of the existing barn which is a curtilage building.

4.3 [P12/V2494/FUL](#) - Withdrawn (01/03/2013)

Demolition of existing barn and erection of new dwelling, revert sub-divided farmhouse back into a single dwelling.

4.4 [P09/V1324](#) - Approved (04/09/2009)

Erection of detached garage with playroom/store over.

4.5 [P07/V1692](#) - Approved (11/12/2007)

Amendment to planning permission PUS/4700/7 for enlargement of garage to provide a two bay garage with workshops and stores with gym/art studio above.

4.6 [P05/V1410](#) - Approved (15/11/2005)

Erection of a garage (Brotherton Barn).

4.7 [P05/V6583/LB](#) - Approved (25/08/2005)

Conversion of farm buildings to 3 dwellings. Removal of modern buildings and associated hardware (re-submission)

4.8 [P05/V0969](#) - Approved (25/08/2005)

Conversion of farm buildings to 3 dwellings. Removal of modern buildings and associated hardware (re-submission)

4.9 [P04/V0336/LB](#) - Approved (07/06/2004)

Restoration and conversion of 4 farm buildings to form 3 dwellings. Removal of modern agricultural building and associated apparatus.

4.10 [P04/V0335](#) - Approved (07/06/2004)

Restoration and conversion of 4 farm buildings to form 3 dwellings. Removal of modern agricultural building and associated apparatus.

4.11 [P01/V0338/LB](#) - Approved (08/08/2002)

Restoration and conversion of farm buildings to three dwellings.

4.12 [P01/V0337](#) - Approved (08/08/2002)

Restoration and conversion of farm buildings to three dwellings.

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**

Paragraph 28: Planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new

development. To promote a strong rural economy, local and neighbourhood plans should:

- support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings;
- promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses;
- support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors, and which respect the character of the countryside. This should include supporting the provision and expansion of tourist and visitor facilities in appropriate locations where identified needs are not met by existing facilities in rural service centres; and
- promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship

Paragraph 55: To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as:

- the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside; or
- where such development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets; or
- where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting; or
- the exceptional quality or innovative nature of the design of the dwelling. Such a design should:
  - be truly outstanding or innovative, helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas;
  - reflect the highest standards in architecture;
  - significantly enhance its immediate setting; and
  - be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

## **5.2 Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 policies:**

- H13 - Development elsewhere
- GS2 – Development in the countryside
- GS6 - Redevelopment of buildings outside settlements
- H13 - Extension to dwelling
- DC1 - Design
- DC13 - Flood risk and water run-off
- DC14 - Flood risk and water run-off
- DC5 - Access
- DC6 - Landscaping
- DC7 - Waste collection and recycling

DC9 - Impact of development on neighbouring uses  
HE4 - Development within the setting of a listed building

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 6.1 The key issue in considering this application is the principle of the proposed development. The application essentially seeks permission for a very large new home in an isolated rural location, as the other proposed works do not require planning permission. The nearest settlement is Pusey which is a very small settlement about 1.1 miles away. The site, therefore, is in open countryside. Local plan policies GS2, GS6 and H13, therefore apply, and gives great weight to resisting new development in such open countryside locations. In addition, with the lack of an agricultural need for the proposed dwelling, the proposal is considered to be contrary to paragraph 55 of the NPPF.
- 6.2 In terms of scale, a modern suburban four bedroom home measures approximately 120 –140 square metres in floor area. In this instance, the home proposed is very large, and as such it is considered that it will not “...*widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities,...*” in the area. Therefore, the application is not considered to comply with paragraphs 50 and 55 of the NPPF which state “*Local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as...*”. The above is a clear message from government that very substantial homes in open countryside, isolated from the social, retail, employment, medical and leisure facilities that support a modern lifestyle are not sustainable development.
- 6.3 Paragraph 55 of the NPPF also refers to the special circumstances where residential development may be acceptable in the countryside. Again, it is considered that the proposed development does not fall within any of the categories mentioned i.e. it is not for a rural worker, would not provide or enable a viable use for a heritage asset/building, does not involve the use of redundant buildings, and does not involve exceptional design quality, however much emphasis is placed by the applicant (in their design and access statement) on the “green” attributes of the proposed dwelling such as solar power, rainwater recycling etc. The carbon footprint caused by a highly car dependent lifestyle has not been accounted for and so little weight can be afforded to these proposed “green” measures, however well intended they are.
- 6.4 The NPPF at paragraph 28 states the circumstances where rural housing growth should be encouraged. It is considered that the proposed dwelling does not fall within any of the categories mentioned, i.e. supporting a rural enterprise, forming part of a programme of agricultural diversification, assisting rural tourism or helping to develop/retain rural services/facilities. Therefore, the proposal is not compliant with the NPPF and accordingly, it is considered that the National Planning Policy Framework does not provide a justification for this new dwelling in the countryside.
- 6.5 The Vale of White Horse Local Plan policy GS6 iv) states that outside the built-up area of settlements, the redevelopment of existing buildings will only be permitted where it is for a new dwelling which replaces an existing dwelling and then only on a one-for-one basis, and subject to the requirement that the new dwelling is not more than 50% larger by volume than the dwelling it replaces.
- 6.6 The applicant has argued that no additional dwelling would be created because the farmhouse would be converted back into a single dwelling. It is considered, however, that these circumstances do not represent a ‘replacement dwelling’ under the terms of the policy because an existing dwelling is not being demolished and so no residential

floor space would be replaced only additional floor space created. The reinstatement of the farmhouse into a single dwelling does not require planning permission. In any event, the replacement dwelling appears to be, in the absence of any stated figures, approximately five times the size of the dwelling it “replaces”. For this additional reason it is considered that the application conflicts with policy GS6.

6.7 **Design**

The proposed dwelling would have a much smaller footprint and bulk than the existing modern barn it would replace and it is considered that the proposed design reflects traditional local character. The removal of the agricultural barn and the proposed works to the listed building are welcomed and can proceed irrespective of the outcome of this application. Setting aside the sustainability issues, and focussing on the design and appearance, the proposal is considered to be acceptable and complies local plan policy DC1. Parking, drainage, arboricultural works, landscaping and other matters are all considered to be acceptable and, therefore, the proposal is considered to comply with policies DC5, DC6, DC7, DC9, DC13 and DC14.

6.8 **Impact on setting of listed building**

It is considered that the demolition of the existing barn and the replacement with a smaller, less bulky dwelling of a vernacular design would enhance the setting of the listed farmhouse and, therefore, the proposal is considered to comply with local plan policy HE4.

6.9 **Impact on wider landscape**

Whilst it is considered the replacement of the existing barn by the proposed dwelling would afford some enhancement of the wider landscape, this could be reduced over time by domestic paraphernalia and outbuildings. However, this could be controlled to some extent by the use of conditions removing permitted development rights. It is considered, therefore, that the impact on the wider landscape would be acceptable and so the proposal complies with local plan policy NE7.

6.10 **Housing land shortage**

The application, as submitted, states that the works do not involve a net increase in dwelling units. However, given that the works to change a semi-detached dwelling into a single unit do not require planning permission (only listed building consent) a new home is considered to be proposed. The notion that a pair of semi-detached properties can be purchased, converted into a single unit and the building of a new unit nearby ought to be considered a “replacement dwelling”, is not a view that your officers share with the applicant. By definition, a *replacement* process involves demolition, and that subsequent *replacement* development ought to occur on the same parcel of land.

6.11 In summary, it is your officer’s view that a new dwelling is proposed, and therefore a contribution would be made towards the five year housing land supply, albeit a very small one. Such a consideration in this case, however, cannot outweigh the sustainability concerns explained above.

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

7.1 Although the proposed development would benefit the setting of the listed building and the wider landscape, it is considered that it constitutes a new dwelling in the countryside which is contrary to local plan policies GS2, GS6 and H13, and paragraphs 28 and 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

7.2 For clarity and the avoidance of doubt, it is considered that the proposed development does not represent a ‘replacement’ dwelling and the site lies in the open countryside.

and the proposal, therefore, is contrary to local plan policies GS2, GS6 and H13 and the NPPF.

## 8.0 RECOMMENDATION

Refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

1. **New home in open countryside - The site is remote from any village boundary, and is also not “infill”, with no frontage to extend. The arguments surrounding a “replacement” dwelling are not considered to be accurate or reasonable. Considering, at the very least that demolition is taking place the new unit is several times the size of the one it “replaces”. Therefore the proposals constitute a new unit, and as such the intensification of residential development in this location is not considered acceptable, which is clearly “creep” in nature in open countryside. Contrary to local plan policies GS2, GS6 and H13 and the NPPF at paragraph 55.**
2. **Not like-for-like - Policy GS6 iv) states that outside built-up areas, redevelopment of existing buildings will only be permitted where on a one-for-one basis. This is further qualified by the new dwelling being no more than 50% larger by volume than the dwelling it replaces. Although figures are not provided, by crude calculations, the new unit is several multiples larger than the unit it “replaces” (see reason 1). Therefore the proposals are not considered to accord with policy GS6 of the local plan.**
3. **Does not add to a “mix” of homes – The large scale of the home proposed (404m<sup>2</sup>) will not add to “...the choice and mix of homes available...” in the area and no agricultural exception has been proposed. Policy H13’s subtext, (Para 8.58) a list of smaller settlements is provided, the nearest of which is over one mile from the site. Therefore, it is considered that no allowance for new dwellings is allowed and that the application is contrary to local plan policies GS6 and H13 and the NPPF at paragraph 50.**
4. **Sustainability – There are no local facilities whatsoever in the area, including educational, leisure, medical, retail and employment. The nearest large village is over four miles away meaning that prospective occupants would lead a highly unsustainable lifestyle. Therefore the proposal is contrary to the principles of the NPPF, which supports “sustainable development” at paragraph 197.**

Author: Mark Doodes  
Contact number: 01235 540519  
Email: [mark.doodes@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:mark.doodes@southandvale.gov.uk)