

Application No: 14/0711C

Location: Dingle Farm, DINGLE LANE, SANDBACH, CHESHIRE, CW11 1FY

Proposal: Listed building consent for alterations to an existing Grade II Listed farmhouse, demolition of 2no. outbuildings, conversion of barn into 1no. dwelling, construction of 6no. dwellings together with associated garaging, car parking and landscaping works (resubmission of application 12/2552C)

Applicant: Beneficiaries the Estate of J M Goodwin

Expiry Date: 02-Apr-2014

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: Grant Listed Building Consent

MAIN ISSUES:

Impact on the Listed Building

REASON FOR REFERRAL

The application has been referred to the Southern Planning Committee at the request of the Principal Planning Manager.

DESCRIPTION AND SITE CONTEXT

The application site comprises a part brownfield, part green field site accessed from Dingle Lane, which is in close proximity to Sandbach town centre. Contained within the site are a Grade II Listed farmhouse, barn and other ancillary buildings. Dingle Lane currently gives access through the site to Waterworks House, which currently has planning permission for 12 houses granted at appeal (12/1650C). The vehicular access to that site will be closed, but pedestrian access would still be available.

The List description of the Farmhouse is as follows:

“Dingle Farmhouse (Formerly listed under Back Street) SJ7660 2/33 11.8.50.II 2. C17. Timber frame with painted brick noggin; C19 alterations and additions; one storey plus attic;3 C19 gabled dormers with small-paned iron casements; early C19 wood doorcase with hood canopy

on shaped brackets, and 6-fielded-panelled door. Later bay on left-hand side sham painted as timber frame. Later additions at rear; tiles.”

The site is designated as being within the Settlement Zone Line of Sandbach and partly within the Sandbach Conservation Area. To the west and south of the site is existing residential development.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

The proposal is for alterations to an existing Grade II Listed farmhouse, demolition of two outbuildings, and conversion of the existing barn into one dwelling, and the construction of 6 dwellings together with associated garaging, car parking and landscaping works.

Part of the farmhouse adjacent to the access would be demolished in order to open up the access to the site and the adjacent barn would be converted to a dwelling. Four dwellings would be erected facing the barn to form a courtyard and two cottages would be erected to the rear of these, facing the access road.

RELEVANT HISTORY

12/2552C 2013 Refusal for Listed Building Consent for alterations to an existing Grade II Listed farmhouse, demolition of two outbuildings, conversion of barn into one dwelling, construction of 11 dwellings together with associated garaging, car parking and landscaping works. (Application under appeal)

12/2551C 2013 Refusal for full planning permission for alterations to an existing Grade II Listed farmhouse, demolition of two outbuildings, conversion of barn into one dwelling, construction of 11 dwellings together with associated garaging, car parking and landscaping works. (Application under appeal)

These applications were refused for the following reasons:

12/2552C

The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed development would have an adverse impact upon the Listed Building. As a result the proposed development is contrary to Policies BH4 and BH5 of the Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review 2005 and guidance contained within the NPPF.

12/2551C

The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed development would result in an over intensive form of development that would have an adverse impact upon the setting of the Listed Building and the character of the area. As a result the proposed development is contrary to Policies GR1, GR2 and BH4 of the Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review 2005 and guidance contained within the NPPF.

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework

Local Policy

Paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise, decision-takers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);

the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and

the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

In view of the level of consultation already afforded to the plan-making process, together with the degree of consistency with national planning guidance, it is appropriate to attach enhanced weight to the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy - Submission Version in the decision-making process.

At its meeting on the 28th February 2014, the Council resolved to approve the *Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy – Submission Version* for publication and submission to the Secretary of State. It was also resolved that this document be given weight as a material consideration for Development Management purposes with immediate effect.

The relevant policies of the **Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy – Submission Version** are:

SE 7 The Historic Environment

The relevant policies saved in the **Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review** are:

BH4 & BH5 Listed Buildings

VIEWS OF TOWN COUNCIL

Members object to demolition of any part of a Listed Building.

Documents provided were misleading in parts, with inconsistencies in stated number of outbuildings to be demolished and number of proposed houses; never the less, Members feel 6 or 8 houses to be over intensive for the site area.

Contravening Policies GR1 (iv & v) and GR6 (iv & v), the development will have adverse impact on neighbours through increased traffic via poor access and will cause harm to existing building foundations.

Members offer no objection to conversion of the barn.

OTHER REPRESENTATIONS

At the time of report writing, approximately 71 representations have been received relating to this application. These can all be viewed online on the application file. 55 were opposed to the development and 15 in favour and 1 petition with 15 signatories objecting to the proposal. The objections express concerns about the following issues:

Land Use

- This is a popular civic amenity used by many people
- Reduction in the number of dwellings does not reduce the harm
- Development would not enhance the landscape character of the area
- Farmhouse are supposed to have fields around them
- Will ruin the view from the lane to the town centre
- Loss of a lovely area used by children and walkers
- As there is less development there would only be half the public benefit

Highways

- Dingle Lane is too narrow for more traffic and would become more dangerous
- Dangerous access
- Junction of Dingle Lane and Dingle Bank is already very dangerous
- Adverse impact of construction traffic on highway safety
- The SHLAA allocation does not take account of the need to demolish part of the Listed Building
- Proposals do not take into account the impact on footpath 11

Amenity

- Loss of privacy
- Noise during development

Design

- Changes to boundary treatments

Ecology

- Adverse impact on the wildlife corridor

Heritage

- Part demolition of a Grade II Listed Building should not be allowed to gain access to the site
- Damage to the setting of the Listed Building
- Adverse impact on the Conservation Area
- Adverse impact of construction traffic on the Listed Building
- Loss of the TPO tree
- Damage to a heritage asset contrary to the NPPF
- The benefit does not outweigh the harm as required by the NPPF

Other

- The application should just be refused again
- Plenty of housing is already planned for Sandbach
- Land stability

- Drainage and flooding
- There is obviously a plan A and Plan B where the previous proposal on the north side of Dingle Lane would come back in
- Previous application was objected to by over 700 people

Those in favour of the application made the following observations:

- Important to bring this type of housing into the area
- Would significantly improve the area
- Would like to move back to Sandbach and live in such a sustainable location
- Would help to reduce anti social behaviour
- We need more housing of this type as close to the town centre as possible
- Will make use of a plot of land that will become unkempt
- The land is no longer required for agricultural purposes
- Sandbach should be allowed to evolve, age and grow
- Will secure the renovation of the Listed Building
- The proposed houses would complement the farmhouse
- Very sustainable location and in keeping with the Conservation Area
- Surprised that the development was not approved previously. This committee needs some younger members who are not afraid of change
- Would reduce the need for car use

OFFICER APPRAISAL

It should be noted that this application relates only to the alterations to the Listed Building and the barn conversion which is a curtilage building and therefore subject to the listing.

Heritage

NPPG

Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Appropriate conservation of heritage assets is one of the core planning principles. It further identifies that heritage assets are irreplaceable and that conservation is an active process of maintenance and managing change. The Framework provides a clear basis for decision making to conserve, and where appropriate enhance, in a manner consistent with their significance. Part of the public value of heritage assets is the contribution they can make to understanding and interpreting the past.

It highlights the importance of understanding significance and the contribution of setting. It reinforces the need for assessment of the impact and whether changes enhance or detract from significance or the ability to appreciate it. In regard to setting it advises that it is the surroundings within which an asset is experienced and that it may be more extensive than curtilage. The multi facets of setting, in addition to visual considerations, are highlighted. It further emphasises that setting does not depend on public access.

In assessing the degree of harm, it refers to both the physical asset but also its setting and that assessing whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be for the judgement of the decision maker. It comments however that substantial harm is a high test and unlikely to occur in many instances.

Design

The guidance stresses that good design is integral to sustainable development and that planning should drive up standards across all forms of development. Good design is considered to be about achieving development that works well in terms of aesthetics, longevity, functionality and adaptability. It highlights both the function and identity of a place, both short and long term and that planning authorities should refuse poor design.

The guidance sets out design objectives including local character (including landscape setting), as well as other functional, environmental and social objectives. In respect to local character, it stresses the need to respond to and reinforce local distinctiveness and local man-made and natural heritage. Successful integration is seen as an important design objective. In designing new development, landform, natural features and local heritage are highlighted as place shaping considerations.

Local building form and detail reinforces distinctive place qualities and can be successfully interpreted in new development without slavish reproduction. It states “*Standard solutions rarely create a distinctive identity or make best use of a particular site*”. High quality hard and soft landscape helps to successfully integrate development in the wider environment.

In regard to what makes a well designed place, achieving a distinctive character is emphasised, relying on physical attributes such as the local grain, building forms, detail/materials, style and vernacular, landform and landscape. It stresses that distinctiveness is not solely about the built environment but also function, history, culture and its potential for change. The guidance also provides more detailed advice in relation to various design considerations: layout, form, scale, detailing and materiality.

The site is that of Dingle Farmhouse and its associated land to the south east of Dingle Lane. Dingle Farmhouse is a Grade II Listed Building and is located on the edge of the Sandbach Town Centre Conservation Area, the boundary of which is drawn quite tightly to the north east of the farmhouse and Shippen. The status of the Conservation Area and its review is discussed later in the report. The entire application site is located within the town settlement boundary.

Dingle Farm, listed grade II is described in the list description as:

DINGLE LANE 1. 5144 Dingle Farmhouse (Formerly listed under Back Street) SJ 7660 2/33 11.8.50. II 2. C17. Timber frame with painted brick nogging; C19 alterations and additions; one storey plus attic; 3 C19 gabled dormers with small-paned iron casements; early C19 wood doorcase with hood canopy on shaped brackets, and 6-fielded-panelled door. Later bay on left-hand side sham painted as timber frame. Later additions at rear; tiles.

Dingle Farmhouse originated as a 17th century timber framed building, but has undergone several phases of development, evolving from a simple, 2 roomed single storey, timber framed building to a building significantly enlarged and altered over time, as explained in the heritage statement. These phases extended it to the east, north and latterly the west, namely the mock painted brick wing, that, along with single storey additions to the rear of the timber framed part of the building, are subject to the applications. The house was also enlarged by creating attic accommodation within the roof space and the insertion of dormer windows.

The building is referred to briefly in *The History of Sandbach* by Cyril Massey, describing it as being of *"timber frame, black and white, with three gabled dormers, good chimney stacks, wood mullioned windows with leaded lights. Formerly it had a thatched roof and stone flag floor"* (p25)

Dingle Farm was part of the Estate of Lord Crewe, whose land and estate holdings included large parts of Sandbach and surrounding parishes and settlements. The Sandbach part of the Crewe estate was sold off during World War I. Many of these former estate properties became owned by their former tenants.

The building's phasing and its associated social history contribute toward its understanding and thereby its heritage significance. They also assist in the understanding of the development of farming practices into and through the Victorian period. This is assessed more fully below.

To the east of the farmhouse, there is a 19th century Shippen, constructed in an L plan form; it has a more ornate southern gable, which reads with the more ornate southern elevation of the farmhouse. This evidences that the principal, more decorative elevation was intended to be the southern elevation, as at that time there was a much more open aspect toward Church Street. The working end of the farm was to the north.

The Shippen is a clearly a curtilage structure, as is a Bull pen to the south east of the Shippen and a modest outbuilding to the north east. The latter is considered to have no heritage significance, whilst the prefabricated garage building to the north is of a more recent date and therefore is not considered an historic curtilage structure.

The site has an extensive open curtilage immediately to the north of the farmhouse and barn and an open aspect beyond that to the north that is contained by a now wooded area of open space (historically it was much more open than it is today). To the east lies Dingle Lake and its associated landscape. To the south east of the site is Dunham Close, a late 20th century housing development, whilst to the northwest of the site further 20th century housing is present.

During part of the latter 20th century, a large building occupied the open area north of the farm, separated from the farmhouse and shippen by a partly enclosed yard or hard standing (this building was located approximately where the more modern garage is now located, but on a significantly larger footprint).

Dingle Lane is a narrow, informal access that changes into a green lane to the north of the farmyard. It has no formal designation in respect to the definitive map but is clearly a longstanding and historic route into Sandbach as evidenced on the Tythe Map and

subsequent OS map editions. There are views into the conservation area, principally of the Church from the Lane. This is recognised in the draft Conservation Area Character Appraisal.

The proposal is for alterations to the existing grade II listed farmhouse, demolition of 2 outbuildings, conversion of the barn to one dwelling and construction of 6 new dwellings, (4 as part of a courtyard closest to the farm and Shippen and 2 detached cottages on the open land to the north), together with access, parking, garaging and landscape works. A full planning application and an application for Listed Building Consent have been submitted for the proposed works.

The works of alteration to the listed building entail partial demolition to the western gable end of the western 19th century wing of Dingle Farmhouse, reducing its length by circa 1 metre and demolition and re-siting of a garden and yard boundary wall to facilitate access improvements and the demolition of a single storey lean to. There are also certain minor works proposed to the interior and exterior of the building including replacement of certain windows and making good as a consequence of the modifications.

Previously, a planning and associated listed building application was refused for a larger proposal that included the paddock to the north west of Dingle Lane, comprising a total of 11 new dwellings (13 proposed dwellings in total with the re-use and conversion). The current application is essentially the same, except for the removal of the housing in the north western paddock (5 units).

The issues associated with the proposals can be broken down as follows:

Built Heritage Considerations

In regard to proposals affecting heritage assets, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identifies that Local Authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal, including by development affecting the asset's setting, taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise.

A heritage consultant acting for the developer has prepared a heritage assessment to establish the asset's significance. It also considers the impact of the development on this significance. This report has regard to the English Heritage documents, Conservation Principles and The Setting of Heritage Assets in considering its findings and this assessment.

For ease of consideration, these are summarised this in the tables in Appendix 1 of this report: more generally in relation to heritage values relating to fabric and setting in table 1, and then more specifically in relation to setting of the listed building and the conservation area in table 2.

The Draft Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan

This is a draft document and has not been approved for adoption as yet by the Council. In the document it seeks to extend the conservation area boundary to include the curtilage of Dingle Farm, whilst the remaining land ownership (the paddocks) would remain outside the boundary. The management plan identifies a proposal to identify an area of potential

sensitivity with regards to the setting of the conservation area. These 2 parcels of land are suggested to be included in this area of sensitivity.

It should be stressed that these suggested changes to the boundary and identifying an area of sensitivity in respect to setting should not be interpreted to mean no change. It is part of the management strategy to help manage and shape change in and on the periphery of the conservation area, not to stifle it.

Negotiations on the previous applications brought about amendments to the scheme to improve the scheme, being mindful of the conservation area review and management plan, with the objective of accommodating development as sensitively as possible having regard to the relationship to the listed building, to Dingle Lane and the wider conservation area. This influenced negotiation on scale, height and density, on the architectural detail, landscape design and materials palette, the retention of hedging where possible and supplementary hedge and tree planting. In this respect therefore, and on balance, it is considered that the proposals are within the spirit of the draft conservation area appraisal and management plan.

Design

The recommendations made previously in relation to the detailed design of the scheme (except those in relation to the element of the scheme now omitted and the amendments secured) are still relevant and require the attachment of appropriate conditions, should it be considered appropriate that planning permission be granted.

As stressed in relation to the previous planning application, a key issue affecting the quality and success of the development will be the quality of the open space and landscaping within the scheme, not least the character and quality of the courtyard and the quality of the palette of surface materials for that area and surfacing of Dingle Lane. Indications of this palette have been submitted with the application. Whilst the general palette is considered appropriate, there is still scope for refinement. Cobbles should be used extensively to reinforce sense of place. This final landscape detail could be secured by condition.

New walling should be of a characteristic bond such as English Garden Wall Bond and include a quality coping detail to reinforce the quality of the space.

There is also the potential to secure more tree planting and hedging to help further soften the development. Also the respective plans need to show the same detail. Currently the landscape details plan and the Landscaping materials plan conflict in relation to certain aspects of detail.

Consideration of Third Party Comments

In respect to heritage issues third party comments essentially centre on 2 main issues: the principle of demolition of part of the west wing of the building and the impact of the development on the setting of the listed building and the conservation area, principally arising from the relationship of the courtyard housing in proximity to the listed building, the formalisation of Dingle Lane and impact on important views from Dingle Lane.

As a point of clarification, the proposed works to the west wing do not directly affect fabric of the 17th century phase of the building. The demolition to the rear to remove the lean to elements will also better reveal the timber frame of the oldest part of the building. The west wing is essentially the latest phase of the building, circa mid 19th century and therefore, its individual significance is weighted accordingly. In short it holds less importance in heritage value terms than earlier fabric for the reasons explained above.

The conclusion reached in regard to the impact of the development on fabric and setting is that it would lead to less than substantial harm individually and cumulatively. In the context of the NPPF any harm to significance has to be clearly justified and then weighed against the public benefits derived from the development if that harm is less than substantial. This needs to be considered in relation to the policy framework, taking account of the NPPF as a whole and any other material considerations: In essence by weighing the various material considerations.

It has been commented that the reduction in the number of units from the previously refused scheme has weakened the public benefit argument, effectively by halving the benefit. The public benefit derived from the scheme does not just relate to housing supply and therefore this argument is a little simplistic.

The comments also make reference to the future development of the omitted paddock. That is not part of the application and therefore cannot be taken into consideration.

Conclusions

The previous application resulted in a number of refinements to the scheme to address concerns raised at officer level. These included:

- Modification to the design to enable retention of part of the western wing of Dingle Farmhouse, including retaining a chamfered gable end
- A less formal access design and improved palette of surfacing materials, including natural stone, re-claimed cobbles and Tegula setts
- Refinements to the architectural design of new houses
- Reduction in the scale and change in the housing type and positioning of building on the northern paddock area
- Retention and enhancement of areas of hedging, new hedge planting and the planting of trees
- Refinement to the design and materiality of the courtyard area to the north of the listed building.

Having assessed again the impacts of the proposal, it is considered that individually and cumulatively the proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the listed building and the associated setting and that of the conservation area. The NPPG stresses that substantial harm is a high test affecting few cases and therefore this reinforces the view that the harm arising from the proposals would be less than substantial.

In the context of the NPPF, as part of the planning balance members need to be convinced that there is clear and convincing justification for the harm and that the public benefits justify the harm being caused.

This is quite a finely balanced case between harm and benefit , but one aspect of that public benefit is the investment in and sustaining the long term future of the listing building and the Shippen. Consequently, on balance it is considered that the proposal is acceptable.

CONCLUSIONS

On balance it is considered that the impacts on the Listed Building and Sandbach Conservation Area would represent less than substantial harm.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit.
2. Compliance with the approved plans.
3. Submission of materials for the rebuilt gable and garden walls including finish to brickwork, to be constructed using a lime mortar, details to be agreed and a sample for gable wall end and wall to be submitted..
4. Submission and implementation of boundary treatment scheme.
5. Submission of a method statement for the demolition and re-building of the western gable wall of Dingle Farm and the garden wall including the means of support to the building during any development works on the site.
6. Working details of the re-built wall to be submitted.
7. Working drawing of windows to the farmhouse to be submitted.
8. A full schedule of internal works (including a method statement) to the farmhouse and barn to be provided.
9. Full photographic survey of the farmhouse and barn to be submitted.
10. All fascias, barge and verge boards to be in timber.
11. Details of dormer windows including materials for faces and cheeks.
12. Details of conservation rooflights.
13. Full details of new internal doors, surrounds, flooring and skirting boards.
14. All rainwater goods (farmhouse, barn, dwellings and ancillary buildings) to be in cast metal and painted black. Details to be submitted, agreed and implemented.

In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions/informatives/planning obligations or reasons for approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the Principal Planning Manager has delegated authority to do so in consultation with the Chairman of the Southern Planning Committee, provided that the changes do not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision.

APPENDIX 1

Table 1: heritage values and assessment of impact

Heritage value	Assessment of contribution toward significance	Assessment of the impact of proposals
<p><i>Evidential value</i></p> <p>Evidential value derives from the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity.</p>	<p>Dingle Farm is a multi phase building, with its earliest fabric dating back to the 17th century. It has been extended several times, during the 18th and 19th centuries. These phases and extensions evidence the evolution of the property, the building technologies and styles and the changes in farming practices at the site, but also more generally in Cheshire.</p> <p>The building retains a number of historic elements internally, including clearly discernible plan form and historic fittings that inform about the simpler origins of the building and its layout, as well as later elements that indicate how the use of the building evolved and became more ornate and complex over time. It also highlights the level of investment and improvement to both improve and enlarge the habitable accommodation but also to facilitate more refined farming practices.</p> <p>Whilst the west wing is the latest of the additions to Dingle Farm, it holds some evidential value in the change of building materials, the trend in sham painting of timber framing and internally with the inclusion of a second staircase (potentially evidencing</p>	<p>The proposals entail the partial demolition of the western wing, reducing it by approximately 1.1m in length to enable widening of Dingle Lane. This will result in the loss of the staircase and will also change the dimensions of this part of the building but will retain evidence of this later wing of the house, albeit modified.</p> <p>It will also entail the demolition and rebuilding of walling to the yard and to the front of the property and demolition of single storey extensions to the rear of the property, behind the original timber framed part of the building. This will lead to the loss of some historic fabric dating from the 19th century.</p> <p>The works will also involve the taking down of an internal dividing wall in the northern extension and the lifting and relaying of stone flooring to incorporate a damp proof course. The proposed drawings for the Farmhouse indicate the insertion of a number of new windows and replacement of inappropriate existing ones.</p> <p>On the proposed drawings, there is a note that all significant historic fittings such as the main staircase, built-in cupboards, doors and architraves, and the 18th century timber coat pegs will be retained and conserved. It also states that a schedule of repairs/method statement for conservation works are to be set out and agreed in accordance with conditions set out in planning and listed building consent</p> <p>The conversion of the Shippen will largely retain its layout, whilst few of the original internal fittings and features of interest</p>

	<p>multiple occupation of the building). The chamfered design of the gable end of the building reflects its relationship with Dingle Lane and presumably common access rights along the lane. The Tithe Map indicates the dashed line of a footpath along the route of the green lane, through where the park is today and emerging on Congleton Road (to the south of where junction 17 is now.) This is also shown on subsequent OS map editions.</p> <p>The Shippen and the Bull Pen further evidence the evolution of the farm and changes in agricultural practice, whilst the detailing of the southern elevation of both Dingle Farmhouse and the Shippen illustrate the original arrangement and orientation of the building and where it was primarily viewed from. This attention to detail also reflects the investment by the Crewe Estate, whereby it is documented that the works commissioned by the estate on its buildings were executed to a high quality. The black and white timber and panel detail is a signature piece of the estate style, evident across various settlements that were part of the Crewe Estate.</p>	<p>remain. Generally existing openings will be re-used with some adaptation. The ventilation holes in the brickwork are to be treated sensitively to maintain their external appearance, and the feature elevation on the south will remain unaffected. New windows and doors will be in timber and of an appropriate design all of which is controllable by condition. 7 conservation roof lights are proposed to be inserted in the roof; again the design is to be controlled by condition.</p> <p>There will be some impact upon the fabric and therefore the evidential value of Dingle Farmhouse, principally as a consequence of the partial demolition and shortening of the west wing of the building, loss of the later staircase and associated boundary walling. However, in the context of the asset as a whole and the greater significance of the earlier building phases this does not substantially undermine its evidential value. Retention of a proportion of the west wing and its chamfered gable retains evidence of this phase of the building and its relationship to Dingle Lane.</p> <p>Given that substantial harm is a 'high test' as advocated in the PPG (see section 2 of the comments), it is considered that the proposed development would lead to less than substantial harm upon evidential values.</p>
<p>Historic value</p> <p>Derives from the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected</p>	<p>The property along with much of the town formed part of the estate of Lord Crewe, however there is no evidence available at present that it was the residence of he or any</p>	<p>The proposed development will have no bearing on the historic value of the property deriving from its association with Lord Crewe's estate. The property's ownership as part of the Crewe estate ended in the early part of the 20th century.</p>

<p>through a place to the present</p>	<p>relatives or other noteworthy persons.</p> <p>The property was adapted and extended during its ownership by the Crewe estate, including the construction of the Shippen and the later western wing.</p> <p>The property was sold by the estate in the early 20th century and therefore no longer retains that association.</p>	<p>The simpler character of the western wing extension may also indicate that this work was not commissioned and implemented by the estate.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposals will have a neutral impact upon historic values, as the previously documented historic association with the Crewe Estate remains unaffected by the proposal, given that the Estate's ownership of the Farm ended a century ago.</p>
<p><i>Aesthetic /architectural value</i></p> <p>Derives from the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place</p>	<p>Conservation principles break this down into consciously designed value and also that which arises fortuitously by the collective acts and qualities of a place i.e. its informal, collective qualities in its setting, including the patina of age.</p> <p>Aspects of Dingle Farm are consciously designed and therefore acquire aesthetic value from the intent behind that process, not least the original and then subsequent plan and arrangement of the Farmhouse, and the more picturesque and ornate qualities of the southern facade that forms its principal elevation. The informal arrangement of the northern elevation reflects its purpose as the working end of the building during the farm's enlargement and adaptation. The chamfered design of the western extension was a design response to the constraints and relationship of</p>	<p>The proposed development will lead to the partial demolition and therefore modification and reduction in the length of the western wing and associated garden/yard walling. It will retain however, the chamfered footprint and the re-constructed boundary walling will be rebuilt. The earlier parts of the building will remain and be conserved, whilst the demolition of the single storey later additions will make the timber frame of the rear elevation more visible. Purely in aesthetic terms therefore, the impact on aesthetic/architectural value will be neutral.</p> <p>With regard to the setting of the farmhouse, the new development will introduce change, both physical and in terms of the general openness of the northern foreground to the site (part of its setting). However, this is an unusually open setting and one that was effectively the rear working area of the farm, with a large agricultural building on this site in the latter part of the 20th century. Introducing further development will reduce the tranquillity of the area and will limit the wider view as a consequence of the courtyard housing. It will however retain the principal visual relationship of the</p>

	<p>the building to Dingle Lane.</p> <p>There is an argument that the 19th century western wing detracts aesthetically and architecturally from the assemblage of the earlier parts of the building, particularly when viewed from the south. However, its negative impact is balanced by evidential and historic values.</p> <p>In respect to the Shippen, the design responded to evolving agricultural and animal welfare practices, whilst its southern elevation was 'dressed' to respond to positively to its relationship to the farmhouse and its wider setting. A more rudimentary approach was adopted in respect to the design of other elevations.</p> <p>With regards to setting, the relationship of the site to the central feature of the conservation area, the Church is most evident in the view of the farmhouse, with church beyond, although the open foreground does provide a more panoramic view of the foreground to the listed building and the southern area of the conservation area. In this respect, an important view into the conservation area has been identified from Dingle Lane within the Conservation Area Character Appraisal.</p> <p>Existing development in proximity to the farmhouse</p>	<p>farmhouse with the church as a backdrop viewed within a narrowed vista from Dingle Lane.</p> <p>The formalisation to Dingle Lane will also have a bearing on the users of the Lane and its aesthetic character, both in terms of the setting to Dingle Farmhouse and the Conservation Area. The widening of the lane will also influence the setting. A high quality palette of more sensitive materials is suggested on the Landscape proposals and materials plans.</p> <p>The proposed development will have some limited detrimental impact upon the setting of the Farmhouse and Shippen and the Conservation Area and what this contributes to their heritage significance. However, based upon advice in the NPPG, and as the development will also lead to some aesthetic enhancement, it is considered that the proposed development would lead to less than substantial harm upon the place's aesthetic and architectural value.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>has eroded its setting by virtue of relationship and scale, not least the bungalows to the south. However, the open aspect to the north does contribute to how the asset is presently experienced. However, it also unusual, in that many farms include outbuildings that create a stronger sense of enclosure to define their working curtilage. Consequently the principle of enclosure in itself does not necessarily mean that development would adversely affect the setting.</p>	
<p>Communal/group</p> <p>Derives from the meaning of a place for the people who relate to it</p>	<p>Evidence of communal value is quite limited.</p> <p>Dingle Farm was owned by the Crewe Estate until the early 19th century and therefore that association is still valued by the community.</p> <p>As a remnant timber framed building Dingle Farm is valued by the community as is the tranquillity and informality of its setting.</p>	<p>The property was owned by Lord Crewe who was a major figure and benefactor for the town, although the Crewe Estate owned much of the town at that time.</p> <p>The extent of opposition to the proposals is some evidence of the strong community feelings in relation to both the works to the building but also development in its setting.</p> <p>There will be some changes to the building and its setting but as described above, these will be less than substantial in nature. Whilst the community concerns are noted, the impact on communal value will be less than substantial as the asset is being retained and the past community associations will remain unaffected.</p>
<p>Summary of impact</p>	<p>The PPG has clarified that substantial harm is a 'high test' (see quote in section 2 of these comments).</p> <p>It is considered that the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building and its curtilage buildings both in terms of the impact on its historic fabric, character and appearance and the contribution to its significance made by its setting.</p> <p>In respect to the significance of the Conservation Area and the contribution made by its setting, the proposals will also result in less than substantial</p>	

	harm, both to the area of the conservation area focused upon Dingle Lane, but also the conservation area as a whole (as discussed in more detail below)
--	---

(c) Crown copyright and database rights 2014. Ordnance Survey 100049045, 100049046.

