

Application Number: DM/2018/00894

Proposal: Conversion of existing outbuilding into two new 3-bedroom dwelling houses

Address: Hatcham Barn, Cwrt William Jones, Monmouth, NP25 3AE

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Jupp

Plans: Ecology Report Acer Ecology, Hatcham Barn, Monmouth, Bat and Nesting Bird Survey dated October 2018 - , All Existing Plans 17-1045-E2-2 - , Floor Plans - Proposed 17-1045-P3-1 REV A - , Floor Plans - Proposed 17-1045-P3-2 REV B - , Elevations - Proposed 17-1045-P3-3 REV B - , Cross Section 17-1045-P3-4 REV B - , Site Plan 17-1045-P3-5 REV B - , Elevations - Proposed 17-1045-P3-6 REV B - , Location Plan 17-1045-E2-1 - ,

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Case Officer: Ms Jo Draper

Date Valid: 09.10.2018

The application is presented to the Planning Committee as there are more than four objections to the proposals

1.0 APPLICATION DETAILS

1.1 Planning Committee previously considered this application on 5th March 2019. After discussions about the merits of the application, the Committee were broadly satisfied with the proposed development but decided to defer the application to enable officers to review the affordable housing contribution with the applicants. Members considered that the development should seek financial contributions for affordable housing for two dwellings rather than the one dwelling that was being requested by officers. The applicant has since submitted a detailed viability appraisal of the development and officers have considered the proposals against a contribution for two dwellings as requested by Members. The affordable housing contribution for two dwellings would be £51,626.00.

1.2 Unfortunately, the appraisal has evidenced that the scheme would not be viable for the development to provide any financial contribution towards affordable housing. The information submitted by the applicant has been scrutinised by the Council's Senior Housing Strategy & Policy Officer and Planning Officers and it has been concluded that this particular site is not able to provide a financial contribution towards affordable housing.

1.3 It is a basic principle of Local Development Plan Policy S4 that all residential developments (including at the scale of a single dwelling) should contribute to the provision of affordable housing in the local planning area however; this is subject to the viability of each individual scheme. It is worth noting that the Council is currently conducting a consultation exercise on a revised Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) for Affordable Housing that takes account of updated evidence and to provide clarity on key elements of the SPG. If this revised SPG was subsequently adopted this scheme would be exempt from providing a contribution given it is a Listed Building. The overriding issue with this type of development is to retain the important heritage asset. Given that a full viability appraisal of the development has concluded that a financial requirement is not viable for this particular development it is recommended that the application is approved (subject to the conditions outlined in the report below) without any requirement for a financial affordable housing contribution.

1.4 The previous report presented to the Committee meeting held on 5th March 2018 is below.

PREVIOUS REPORT

APPLICATION DETAILS

1.1 The application relates to a former agricultural barn to the rear of St James Square and St James House. The Barn forms part of the curtilage of St James House. St James House is Grade II listed due to its importance as a multiphase building with important fabric from the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries. There is concurrent Listed Building Application for this proposal - reference DM/2018/00895. The application site lies within Monmouth Conservation Area and within

Monmouth's development boundary.

1.2 The application seeks planning consent for the conversion of the rectangular stone building to a residential use to create two units with associated garden and parking. There is a contemporary extension proposed serving both units. The building is within the Monmouth Conservation Area. The site comprises a redundant outbuilding known as Hatcham Barn. The building is arranged on a north-south orientation that extends to the rear of St. James House back to the recent Cwt William Jones development and the rear of terraced houses on The Burgage to the east. The building is a single storey stone building with a low pitch roof covered with iron sheets.

1.3 The barn has been subject to a number of applications for conversion in the past. It was originally part of a much larger application including the sub-division of St James House and adjacent properties back into individual homes following a long-term use of the building by Monmouth School. This building has approval for conversion into residential use for one four-bedroom dwelling as part of a larger scheme for the conversion of the school house building into three separate dwellings.

1.4 It is proposed to retain the vehicular access served from the private drive that leads to the gated vehicular entrance for the Cwrt William Jones site. This access funnels through past two car parking spaces that serve 11 St. James Square (Approved DC/2014/00552), which together with the permission for the four- bedroom unit approved for the barn results in two units being served off this access. This scheme serves to provide three units from this access point. There are two car parking spaces serving each proposed new unit.

1.5 The application has been subject to pre-application enquiry and further amendments have been sought during the course of the application. The previous application proposed to replace the roof with a steeper and equal pitched structure clad in slate and to rebuild the lost gables. The current application seeks, in line with the most recent permission (DC/2014/00552), to replace the roof structure. It was proposed to raise the heads of the walls and the steepness of the pitch of the new roof which would increase the height of the proposed building compared to the previously approved scheme by 2m. This was considered to have a significant impact upon the building's character and the setting of the Listed Building and given the close proximity of the gable wall of the barn, being approximately 9m from the rear of no 11, was considered to have an over-bearing impact. This has been reduced by 0.6m, following a reduction in eaves height and pitch. In addition, it is proposed to add glazing to the increased height covered by external timber louvres, together with sections of solid timber boarding. The roof treatment also proposed is a contemporary alternative to slate and proposes to use grey metal sheeting.

1.6 There is a contemporary single storey extension proposed to the rear of the building, the design of which is broken down into two sections; there is a glass link that connects the main barn to a timber-clad pavilion to the rear of the site, which extends to the rear boundary with a small lean-to timber structure that accommodates the pantry. There has been a change in the type and number of roof lights from the scheme originally submitted. The former consent approved four roof lights, with large sections of glazing proposed over the large doors. Initially the current application featured ten proposed roof lights, but following negotiation these have been reduced to six with the larger sections (as formerly proposed) omitted.

1.7 The section plans show that the first floor accommodation for both proposed units are served by the horizontal window that sits below the roof and on top of the stone wall; this is covered externally with horizontal timber louvres. The corner edges are infilled with timber louvres so the first floor aspect is to the front and rear through the timber louvres and minimises first floor viewpoints on the angle. There are roof lights proposed to the front and rear (3 per unit serving each bedroom). There are no first floor windows proposed on the gable. The extension to the rear is single storey with no first floor windows proposed. The boundary materials have not been specified on the drawings. The garden serving Unit 1 has the most restricted garden with a depth of approximately 10.5m. Unit 2 stretches out for a depth from approximately 12m to 19m in depth.

2.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Reference Number	Description	Decision / Date
DM/2018/00895	Conversion of existing outbuilding into two new 3 bedroom dwelling	houses

Pending Consideration

DC/2017/003418 Change of use from boarding house to single family dwelling (revised design of approvals DC/2014/00552 and DC/2014/00553), demolition of fire escape, internal and external alterations to grade II listed building Approved June 2017

DC/2015/01517 Discharge of conditions 12 and 18, relating to planning application
DC/2014/00553. Approved February 2016

DC/2014/00552 Internal and external alterations to Grade II listed buildings, demolition of modern extensions, fire escape and garage, conversion of existing former boarding house and staff accommodation into three separate dwellings and conversion of an outbuilding within the curtilage of the listed buildings to form a single dwelling (Revised scheme) Approved October 2014.
Associated Listed Building Consent application DC/2014/00553

3.0 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Strategic Policies

S1 LDP The Spatial Distribution of New Housing Provision S16 LDP Transport
S17 LDP Place Making and Design

Development Management Policies

H1 LDP Residential Development in Main Towns, Severnside Settlements and Rural Secondary Settlements
EP1 LDP Amenity and Environmental Protection DES1 LDP General Design Considerations
NE1 LDP Nature Conservation and Development HE1 LDP Development in Conservation Areas
EP1 LDP Amenity
EP3 LDP Lighting

4.0 REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 Consultation Replies

Monmouth Town Council: Approve with Conditions
Complete Bat Survey
Complete Archaeological Survey
Adhere to Welsh Water Guidelines

Gwent Glamorgan Archaeological Trust (GGAT): In order to mitigate the impact of the development on the archaeological resource we recommend the attachment of two conditions. One will address the recording necessary to preserve the barn by record in its current form, and the second to mitigate the impact of the development on the buried archaeological resource.

MCC Heritage Officer: The consideration by the Heritage Officer is that the current condition of the building is an important consideration in the assessment of the application. The building has been subject to extensive alterations over many years. The roof has been completely replaced in the 20th Century and now has a shallow asymmetric roof covered with tin sheeting, which includes the loss of the two gable ends from wall plate level up. There are larger elements of block infill and a regimented form of openings have been added significantly compromising the buildings character and value as a barn.

Therefore the consideration rests with the proposed extension. In consideration, p 4.5 of Managing Change to Listed Buildings states that 'the quality of design and execution should enhance the aesthetic value of the building and its setting, and additions should not dominate'. The rear extension is of a lower scale and mass to the existing building and of a differing style. The form of which is broken down into two sections, a glass linking section adjacent to the existing barn, and a timber clad pavilion to the rear of the site. The rear pavilion is of a traditional pitch and ridge roof construction and is a contemporary interpretation of a former out building which may have been found on the site. The glass link is of a lower scale, with a shallow pitch roof providing a visual break between the out building and the back of the barn. The extension is not considered to be of a scale or mass that dominates the existing building. In addition the chosen palate of materials follows a sympathetic but contemporary design ethos showing a clear distinction between the old and the new. The design approach to the main barn follows a more contemporary approach to barn conversions, and whilst sympathetic, is a more striking design. The extensions, will however retain a

subservient character to the main barn and are not considered to be sufficiently harmful to warrant refusal.

The roof lights have also been reduced in size with the majority of the roof lights on the rear. The applicant also proposes a contemporary style of roof lights, this is a departure from many listed barn conversions, or listed houses where we have insisted on 'conservation style' roof lights. However, at present the building is a heavily modified barn, with modern and unsympathetic alterations. The proposals are to retain the core fabric of the building and adopt a modern interpretation for the new parts of the structure. Conservation style roof lights have a low profile and a central bar which make them more appropriate in a sensitive setting. In this case the applicant is proposing to omit the central bar, but retain the low profile appearance and so, given the more contemporary approach to the remaining modern additions in this instance the application is considered acceptable.

The new roof will have a significant impact on the form of the building when compared to the existing low asymmetric roof. It is considered that a pitched roof is far more appropriate for a building of this type and so the height of the building will be raised from its current position. Following negotiation the proposed increase in height from that previously approved is now considered to be an acceptable alteration and would no longer dominate the listed buildings facing onto the main square. In addition, as with the other alterations the approach adopted is to promote honest intervention, showing new work as new. Here it is proposed to add glazing to the increased height covered by external timber louvres, together with sections of solid timber boarding. The roof is also proposed to use grey metal sheeting, again promoting the use of a simple palate of sympathetic materials in a contemporary manner.

Internally the barn has permission for extensive changes that accommodate a residential use. It is not considered that the proposed changes are more or less harmful than the existing. In addition as the building is only afforded curtilage protection it is not considered that these changes would affect the special character of the primary listed building.

Overall, the building will be much altered, however the existing historic fabric will be maintained and respected. The building is in a poor condition having been subject to a series of inappropriate alterations, which this application seeks to rectify. The modern approach to the design is not considered harmful given the functional nature of the building and the ethos of new work being clearly new. This approach follows the conservation principles that now form the forefront of TAN 24 in Wales.

MCC Housing: It is a basic principle of Local Development Plan Policy S4 that all residential developments (including at the scale of a single dwelling) should make a contribution to the provision of affordable housing in the local planning area. As this site falls below the threshold at which affordable housing is required on site, the calculation of the financial contribution that will be required is set out in the table below. An affordable housing contribution is calculated for the two units.

MCC Highways: The application is for the conversion of existing outbuilding into 2 no. 3 bedroom dwelling houses. The site is served by Cwrt William Jones which is a private access road. The Highway Authority have no comments in respect of the proposal as the nearest publicly maintainable highway (St James Square) will be unaffected.

Notwithstanding the aforementioned it is noted that the proposed car parking provision is below the standards contained in the Monmouthshire Car Parking Standards. The MCC Parking Standards specifies 1 car parking space to be provided per bedroom per dwelling with a maximum of 3 car parking spaces. Should the parking deficiency pose a problem then any displacement is likely to occur within Cwrt William Jones which is a private management issue. It is unlikely that any displacement will occur on the nearest publicly maintainable highway as there are traffic regulation orders in place to control on-street parking.

MCC Ecology: The application for the proposal is informed by a number of ecological assessments, the latest and most relevant of which being:

Acer Ecology, Hatcham Barn, Monmouth, Bat and Nesting Bird Survey dated October 2018. I am satisfied that if the report recommendations are implemented, then there should be no negative impacts on biodiversity as a result of the proposed development. It is recommended that suitable planning conditions are imposed.

Natural Resources Wales: We note that the bat report submitted in support of the above application (Bat and Nesting Bird Survey prepared by Acer Ecology dated October 2018) has identified that bats are present at the application site. We have no objection to the application as submitted but request

that an informative is attached to any planning permission granted. We do not consider that the development is likely to be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in its natural range.

Welsh Water: No objection recommend conditions to be imposed on planning consent 4.2

4.2 Neighbour Notification

To date five objections have been raising the following points (This includes the comments made in receipt of the initial proposals prior to the amended scheme now proposed):

The scale to the measurements on the plans when I put some timbers together to get the visual height of the ridge. It seems to be more in line with the ridge of the adjacent properties which means it is going to be nearly double in height to the existing barn roof line creating another full height floor level on top.

The windows are very much still over-bearing

The design is not within listed building requirement to which we had to adhere too for the vista of the area

The building materials are not in line with what is required to blend into this area

The upper louvered section is so out of character it distracts so much from the existing barn it looks hideous and an absolute carbuncle

The glass joining section is also unacceptable. The tin roof is not what one would expect to see on one of the oldest building in Monmouth. The new sections should be constructed with welsh slate roofs with no timber cladding, this should be stone or render

The windows are also not in keeping with this listed section of Monmouth either

The drawings also show timber feather edged fencing, we have been advised that the Council will only accept stone or Brick walls

Concerned that the archaeological work indicating that there are lower levels to the standing 'barn' has not been considered in the application for the proposed development. Consequently there may be reason for a second archaeological building survey.

The increased height of the proposed renovation when compared with the present standing structure, the new roofline would tend to dominate the surrounding area. The architect's drawing gives the impression that the top of the roof would be lower than it would be; this is most noticeable when comparing the drawings of the proposed structure with those of the William Jones Almshouses adjoining the site on the north.

The proposed extensions to the east of the barn appear to be the equivalent of a new dwelling.

We have no objections to the original application, which did not require building additional new extensions into the garden, this was a reasonable application for the size of the barn. There is also a secondary floor level under the barn which has not been mentioned in this application but is of great interest to listed building and of Archaeological interest with further investigations required.

The drawings and sketches are not representative to each other.

In order to meet the objection to the pre-application proposal the applicant has increased the height of the main barn building in the present proposal. This would have an adverse impact on the properties in The Burgage which look on to this rural setting of the Barn with the church and Rolls Building in the background. This would not comply with planning policy, in particular Policy HE1 criteria a, b and c.

The roof line will be changed significantly to that of the original building. This would not preserve the character and appearance of the area and its landscape setting. Policy HE1 a,b,c criteria would not be met.

We would like assurance that the development does not encroach on the footprint of the "New Dwelling" in previous application DC/2013/00392 this was refused due to its unacceptable impact on dwellings in The Burgage.

Also, we would like assurance that the large tree on the west side of the barn will not suffer damage or felling as a result of the development. Several large trees have already been cut down on this plot that was once a pretty garden.

-We would like assurance that any alterations to the boundary of the plot will require planning approval.

Neighbouring properties were not allowed roof lights for their development

The plans look to try and retain the general character of the building and give it a modern twist

The plans would indicate that the roof ridge line would make the southern gable 8m above the current ground level. This is a significant increase in the current height and would dominate the view from all the rear windows of neighbour's property (11 St. James Square) and the rear courtyard. This perhaps could compromise natural sunlight to the rear of property.

A fire escape would not be acceptable

The perceived height of the main barn has not changed from the original and proposed development.

Concern raised by neighbour regarding position of site notice, this does not constitute display at or near the site and failed to give correct notification of the application.

The proposal in my view is an attempt to reverse the refusal given to the application for redevelopment of the barn into one new residential unit and the construction of a second residential unit on the site which was applied for in 2013 and refused by Development Committee 07.01.14. The current application attempts to over develop the site again by removing the existing roof structure which will destroy what original timbers are in the existing roof in order to raise the overall roof height to allow for insertion of a second storey within the envelope of the building.

In the earlier application a second storey was created within the roof space but as the roof slope reduced the overall area this meant that to achieve two residential units in that application the second had to be a separate totally new build. By resorting to lifting the ridge height by approximately two metres, some of the additional area to create the two units has been achieved. The balance of the additional square area needed is provided by the single storey additions to the rear of the barn little different in terms of overall development the 2013 refused application.

Furthermore by attempting to squeeze two units on the site the following detriment to the listed building itself and the adjacent listed buildings has occurred. Firstly, the necessity to raise the ridge height has destroyed the ancient parts on the roof structure, altered the relationship of the roof to the existing structure of the building and imposed a considerable change to the setting of the barn and its nearby buildings. This has imposed considerable overlooking to the rear gardens of all three properties 10, 11 and 12 St James Square which have only recently been converted back into three residential units from their previous use as a boarding house for Haberdashers School. That permission was granted after considerable debate and attention to maintaining the Listed Building status of those buildings.

Finally I would draw the committee's attention to the provision of only two car parking spaces for each proposed unit which in view of the pressure of on street parking in St James Square is inadequate.

5.0 EVALUATION

5.1 Principle of the proposed development

5.1.1 The application is within the development boundary for Monmouth and therefore the principle of adapting this existing building into two dwellings is acceptable in principle subject to detailed planning considerations in accordance with Policies S1 and H1 of the Local Development Plan (LDP).

5.2 Design

5.2.1 The design of the scheme has been subject to significant negotiations with the Heritage Officer and the Planning case officer. The new roof on the main barn will have a significant impact on the form of the building when compared to the existing low asymmetric roof. However, a pitched roof is far more appropriate for a building of this type and so the height of the building will be raised from its current position. Following negotiations, the proposed increase in height from that previously approved is now considered to be an acceptable alteration and would no longer dominate the listed buildings facing onto the main square. In addition, as with the other alterations the approach adopted is to promote honest intervention, showing new work as new. It is proposed to add glazing to the increased height covered by external timber louvres, together with sections of solid timber boarding; this serves to not only deliver the visual break between the original stone wall and the roof but enables the first floor to be served by light without the proliferation of additional windows that can domesticate the building. The roof material proposed to use grey metal sheeting, again promoting the use of a simple palate of sympathetic materials in a contemporary manner. It is imperative that the external materials are strictly controlled and a high quality natural material is applied to this development. Relevant conditions controlling these materials are proposed accordingly. The Heritage Officer is satisfied that the design approach provides a more contemporary approach to a building conversion, but remains sympathetic to the building's character. The contemporary approach enables the new additions to be clearly seen alongside the original section and this approach works well within this sensitive town centre location.

5.2.2 The rear extension will only be visible from neighbouring properties and will not be within the public realm. The proposed pavilion is of a traditional pitched roof construction and is a contemporary interpretation of a former out-building that may have been found on the site and works well within the rear space. The roof with a shallow pitch roof provides a visual break between the out building and the back of the barn. The extension is not considered to be of a scale or mass that dominates the existing building. In addition, the chosen palate of materials follows a sympathetic but contemporary design ethos showing a clear distinction between the old and the new. The proposed extensions, will however retain a subservient character to the main barn and are not considered harmful to the character and appearance of the heritage assets in accordance with Policy HE1 of the Local Development Plan (LDP).

5.2.3 The roof lights have also been reduced in size and the majority of them are on the rear. The applicant proposes a contemporary style of roof light (which is a departure from many listed building conversions or listed houses where we have insisted on 'conservation style' roof lights). The Heritage Officer has confirmed that at present the building is a heavily modified barn, with modern and unsympathetic alterations. The proposals are to retain the core fabric of the building and adopt a modern interpretation for the new parts of the structure. Conservation style roof lights have a low profile and a central bar that make them more appropriate in a sensitive setting. In this case the applicant is proposing to omit the central bar, but retain the low profile appearance that follows the more contemporary approach to the remaining modern additions. The design of the scheme, subject to appropriate conditions controlling external materials and boundary materials, is acceptable and in compliance with Policy DES1 and in particularly Policy HE1 (Development in Conservation Areas) of the LDP.

5.3 Neighbour Amenity

5.3.1 The application site is bounded on three sides by neighbouring properties and hence there is potential for the proposed development to have an impact upon these properties. The proposed design of the scheme through the treatment and position of first floor windows prevents any overlooking issues arising with a satisfactory separating distance from the barn and the neighbouring boundaries to prevent overlooking into neighbouring properties. There is scope for numbers 10 and 11 The Burgage to look into the garden of the two new proposed dwellings, but this is no more than what could have been viewed with the approved scheme and is acceptable in this urban setting.

5.3.2 The original scheme did raise concerns regarding the proposed development having an over-dominating impact upon the closest neighbouring property, 11 St. James Close, as the gable of this dwelling projects out towards the gable of the barn with a first floor habitable window in the neighbouring property. Previously the scheme sought to raise the roof above the ridge line of the

neighbouring property. The height of the proposed barn has now been lowered and this brings it back down level with the ridge height of the secondary, two-storey gable element to the rear of the neighbouring property. It is not considered in this case that the proposal will have an over-bearing impact upon the neighbouring dwellings and would be acceptable.

5.3.3 With regard to potential obstruction of sunlight, the barn is situated to the north of the neighbouring dwelling 11 St James Square and therefore the increase in height will not have a direct impact in this case.

5.3.4 The proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring property to warrant refusing the application and the proposed development would be in accordance with the requirements of Policy EP1 of the LDP.

5.4 Highway Safety

5.4.1 The applicant was advised that during the pre-application enquiry the proposal should deliver three car parking spaces for a three-bedroom dwelling. This application delivers two spaces per unit. The applicant has supported the reduction with reference to Policy S16 that states that, "Where appropriate, all development proposals shall promote sustainable, safe forms of transport which reduce the need to travel, increase provision for walking and cycling and improve public transport provision. This will be facilitated by: reducing the need to travel, especially by car; favouring development close to public transport facilities; promoting public transport, walking and cycling; improving road safety; minimising the adverse effects of parking; improving public transport links between the County's main towns and other key settlements in the region, in line with the Wales Spatial Plan (WSP), and developing the role of the key settlements of Abergavenny and Chepstow, as identified in the WSP, and Monmouth, around which high capacity sustainable transport links can be developed."

5.4.2 The proposed scheme provides a total of four off-street car parking spaces (two per dwelling). The site is located in a town centre and is identified in the above policy as a key settlement. The agent has argued that given the general thrust of Policy S16, which seeks to reduce the need to travel by car, the site is considered appropriate to provide two car parking spaces per three-bedroom dwelling. The Council's Highways Officer has stated that three spaces is recommended, but given the position of the site served from a private highway, the provision of car parking on site becomes a private management issue and not one that warrants an objection from Highways that would substantiate refusing the planning application in this case. There is also the matter of a further unit served from the single access, again from this private lane. Whilst private this is an access that serves a number of properties at Cwrt Williams Jones and the provision of an additional unit served from this access has not resulted in a highway objection. Indeed, given the number of properties served from this highway the provision of an additional unit is acceptable in this case. On balance, given the central location of the site within Monmouth and the size of the dwellings the level of parking provision for this development is considered to be acceptable.

5.5 Ecology

5.5.1 A bat and bird survey has been submitted with this application. There are a number of conditions that are recommended to ensure the proposal meets with the requirements of Policy NE1. The development will need to be subject to a licence from Natural Resources Wales before work can commence at the site. As a licence is required, the Local Planning Authority will need to consider the 'Three Tests' for European Protected Species

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended)
European Protected Species - Three Tests. In consideration of this application, European Protected Species (bats / otters / dormice / great crested newts) will be affected by the development and it has been established that a derogation licence from Natural Resources Wales will be required to implement the consent. Monmouthshire County Council as Local Planning Authority is required to have regard to the Conservation of Species & Habitat Regulations 2010 (as amended) and to the fact that derogations are only allowed where the three tests set out in Article

16 of the Habitats Directive are met. The three tests have been considered in consultation with NRW / Council Biodiversity and Ecology Officers as follows:

The derogation is in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment.

The development has an existing permission that can be implemented, significant changes can therefore be undertaken at the site under this planning consent. This proposal delivers two smaller units in the place of a single large residential unit. This proposal therefore goes a small way to meeting the strategic housing objectives of the Local Development Plan.

There is no satisfactory alternative

The site has the benefit of planning consent and significant works to be undertaken on the building have already been approved with a previous planning consent.

The derogation is not detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range.

Satisfactory mitigation has been put in place with the relevant use of conditions relating to the bat survey that was submitted in support of the planning application to ensure that the development would not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species.

In the light of the circumstances outlined above which demonstrate that the three tests would be met, and having regard for the advice of Natural Resources Wales and the Council's own Biodiversity Officers, the development is acceptable subject to the suggested conditions and would be in accordance with Policy NE1 of the LDP.

5.6 Tree Protection

5.6.1 The previous approval secured the retention and protection of the large tree to the front of the site with a condition requiring the submission of a tree protection plan. This has been lifted and adapted for the purposes of this application and is recommended to be imposed as a condition of the planning approval to ensure this tree which is a very important feature within the street scene is protected during the course of the works.

5.7 Affordable Housing

5.7.1 MCC's Housing Officer has provided comments that seek a financial contribution for both dwellings. However, the approved scheme for the single unit can be implemented as other developments that form part of the planning approval (DC/2014/00552) have been undertaken. This was approved before the requirement to make an affordable housing contribution was adopted. Thus, it is reasonable that only the one additional dwelling is subject to an affordable housing contribution. It is recommended that a Section 106 Agreement be secured with this application for a financial contribution of £25,813 for the one net additional dwelling unless the development is for self-build development in which case the development would be exempt from a payment.

5.8 Archaeology

5.8.1 Concern has been raised by a neighbour that the archaeological work indicating that there are lower levels to the standing 'barn' has not been considered in the application for the proposed development. Consequently there may be reason for a second archaeological building survey.

5.8.2 GGAT have addressed this directly in stating that they have responded to this in their consultation response. This has taken into account the lower level to the barn and included a recommendation for a historic building recording as a separate condition as well as other archaeological work, both of which require a detailed written scheme as part of the mitigation prior to the building recording and fieldwork being undertaken. A Programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation is recommended as a planning condition. In addition, GGAT requested a condition requiring a programme of historic building recording and analysis - proposed level 2 survey based on the reason that the building is of architectural and cultural significance and the specified records are required to mitigate impact. Suitably worded conditions are suggested to ensure that archaeology at the site is protected in accordance with GGAT

guidance.

5.9 Notification Procedure

5.9.1 There have been concerns raised by a neighbour regarding the notification procedure. All of the adjoining neighbours have been notified of both the original scheme and the revised scheme and given the full statutory period to consider the proposal and make comments. Furthermore, a site notice was posted on the public highway on the corner of St. James House at the junction with St. James Square and Cwrt William Jones. In addition to this, an advertisement was posted in a local newspaper. The requirements for notifying neighbouring properties have been fully satisfied.

5.10 Response to the Representations of Third Parties and Town Council

The objections are considered individually below.

The scale to the measurements on the plans when I put some timbers together to get the visual height of the ridge. It seems to be more in line with the ridge of the adjacent properties which means it is going to be nearly double in height to the existing barn roof line creating another full height floor level on top.

- The drawings and sketches are not representative to each other

Response: The scale and measurements on the plans are correct and represent clearly what is proposed within this application. The issue with the height of the proposal has been addressed within sections 5.2 and 5.3. The revised scheme reduces the ridge and eaves height and is considered to be acceptable.

- The windows are very much still over-bearing

Response: The rooflights have been reduced from ten to six in this scheme, the original windows that are on the approved scheme have been retained on the front (west) elevation with one window opening being used as doorway. The rear (east) elevation has reduced the new openings from the approved scheme with the provision of the horizontal glazing breaking up the wall to roof, this is treated externally with horizontal louvres. There are no windows proposed on either gable. The contemporary extension does have areas of glazing, but this is at ground floor, is secondary to the main barn and it reads as a modern addition.

The design is not within listed building requirement to which we had to adhere too for the vista of the area

The building materials are not in line with what is required to blend into this area

The upper louvered section is so out of character it distracts so much from the existing barn it looks hideous and an absolute carbuncle

The glass joining section is also unacceptable. The tin roof is not what one would expect to see on one of the oldest building in Monmouth. The new sections should be constructed with welsh slate roofs with no timber cladding, this should be stone or render

The windows are also not in keeping with this listed section of Monmouth either

The proposed extensions to the east of the barn appear to be the equivalent of a new dwelling

Response: These issues raised are directly addressed under Paragraph 5.2. This is considered as part of the concurrent Listed Building Application DM/2018/00895. The proposed design of the resultant dwellings is considered to be acceptable and would not harm the character and appearance of the area or the listed building or neighbouring heritage assets.

The drawings also show timber feather edged fencing; we have been advised that the Council will only accept stone or Brick walls

We would like assurance that any alterations to the boundary of the plot will require planning approval.

Response: There have been no boundary treatments agreed as part of this application and a condition has been imposed ensuring that this information is submitted to the Council; permitted development rights are proposed to be removed preventing any further/different boundaries from being erected.

Concerned that the archaeological work indicating that there are lower levels to the standing 'barn' has not been considered in the application for the proposed development. Consequently there may be reason for a second archaeological building survey.

Response: This is addressed in section 5.8 above.

The increased height of the proposed renovation when compared with the present standing structure, the new roofline would tend to dominate the surrounding area. The architect's drawing gives the impression that the top of the roof would be lower than it would be; this is most noticeable when comparing the drawings of the proposed structure with those of the William Jones Almshouses adjoining the site on the north.

Response: This has been addressed as part of sections 5.2 and 5.3.

We have no objections to the original application, which did not require building additional new extensions into the garden, this was a reasonable application for the size of the barn. There is also a secondary floor level under the barn which has not been mentioned in this application but is of great interest to listed building and of Archaeological interest with further investigations required.

Response: This is addressed under section 5.2 and section 5.8.

In order to meet the objection to the pre-app proposal the applicant has increased the height of the main barn building in the present proposal. This would have an adverse impact on the properties in The Burgage which look on to this rural setting of the Barn with the church and Rolls Building in the background. This would not comply with planning policy, in particular Policy HE1 criteria a, b and c.

The roof line will be changed significantly to that of the original building. This would not preserve the character and appearance of the area and its landscape setting. Policy HE1 a,b,c criteria would not be met.

Response: The visual impact of the proposed alterations to the main building are addressed in section 5.2.

We would like assurance that the development does not encroach on the footprint of the "New Dwelling" in previous application DC/2013/00392 this was refused due to its unacceptable impact on dwellings in The Burgage.

Response: The proposal relates to the conversion of the main barn with secondary extensions projecting into the garden, these development do not reflect the independent standalone independent dwelling in the rear garden of the barn that was previously refused planning consent.

We would like assurance that the large tree on the west side of the barn will not suffer damage or felling as a result of the development. Several large trees have already been cut down on this plot that was once a pretty garden.

Response: This is addressed in section 5.6.

Neighbouring properties were not allowed roof lights for their development

Response: This application has been considered on its own merits with a view to what has been approved and can be implemented. The assessment of the design is addressed in section 5.2.

The plans would indicate that the roof ridge line would make the southern gable 8m above the current ground level. This is a significant increase in the current height and would dominate the view from all the rear windows of neighbour's property (11 St. James Square) and the rear courtyard. This perhaps could compromise natural sunlight to the rear of property.

Response: This is addressed in section 5.3.

A fire escape would not be acceptable.

Response: This is not proposed.

The perceived height of the main barn has not changed from the original and proposed development.

Response: This is addressed in section 5.2 and section 5.3. It is notable however that the height of the roof has been lowered both in the eaves height and ridge height, this does help to reduce the overall mass of the roof in comparison with the original scheme. Furthermore, it has been brought back into line with the gable of the neighbouring property (namely 11 St James Square) and reads as a less dominant building than it did in the original scheme.

Concern raised by neighbour regarding position of site notice, this does not constitute display at or near the site and failed to give correct notification of the application.

Response: This is addressed in section 5.9, officers are satisfied that the application has been correctly advertised.

The proposal is an attempt to reverse the refusal given to the application for redevelopment of the barn into one new residential unit and the construction of a second residential unit on the site which was applied for in 2013 and refused by Development Committee 07.01.14

Response: This is an application for two residential units, but this has been delivered by sub-dividing and extending the existing barn, not by creating a standalone building in the rear garden which was what was proposed and refused previously. The two schemes are different.

The current application attempts to overdevelop the site again by removing the existing roof structure which will destroy what original timbers are in the existing roof in order to raise the overall roof height to allow for insertion of a second storey within the envelope of the building.

Response: The merits of the roof as proposed are addressed in section 5.2.

In the earlier application a second storey was created within the roof space but as the roof slope reduced the overall square metreage this meant that to achieve two residential unit in that application the second had to be a separate totally new build. By resorting to lifting the ridge height by approximately two metres some of the additional square metreage to create the two units has been achieved. The balance of the additional square metreage needed is provided by the single storey additions to the rear of the barn little different in terms of overall development the 2013 refused application.

Response: The principle of an additional new dwelling in this location is acceptable subject to detailed considerations. The detailed considerations have been addressed above.

Furthermore by attempting to squeeze two units on the site the following detriment to the listed building itself and the adjacent listed buildings has occurred. Firstly, the necessity to raise the ridge height has destroyed the ancient parts on the roof structure, altered the relationship of the roof to the existing structure of the building and imposed a considerable change to the setting of the barn and its nearby buildings. This has imposed considerable overlooking to the rear gardens of all three properties 10, 11 and 12 St James Square which have only recently been converted back into three residential units from their previous use as a boarding house for Haberdashers School. That permission was granted after considerable debate and attention to maintaining the Listed Building status of those buildings.

Response: This is addressed above in section 5.2 and 5.3.

Committee's attention needs to be drawn to the provision of only two car parking spaces for each proposed unit which in view of the pressure of on street parking in St James Square is inadequate.

Response: This is addressed in section 5.4. On balance, the proposed parking provision is considered to be acceptable.

5.11 Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015

5.8.1 The duty to improve the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales has been considered, in accordance with the sustainable development principle, under section 3 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 (the WBFG Act). In reaching this recommendation, the ways of working set out at section 5 of the WBFG Act have been taken into account and it is considered that this recommendation is in accordance with the sustainable development principle through its contribution towards one or more of the Welsh Ministers' well-being objectives set out in section 8 of the WBFG Act.

5.12 Conclusion

5.12.1 The proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the Listed Buildings or the Conservation Area. The design of the resultant barn is acceptable and the dwellings would be constructed with sympathetic materials that are appropriate for the site. The development would not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the neighbouring parties and the proposed parking provision is considered to be acceptable in this context. The development would be in accordance with the relevant policies in the LDP and is therefore recommended for approval.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE Subject to a 106 Legal Agreement securing an affordable housing contribution of £25,813.00. If the S106 Agreement is not signed within 6 months of the Planning Committee's resolution then delegated powers be granted to officers to refuse the application.

Conditions:

1. This development shall be begun within 5 years from the date of this permission. REASON: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the list of approved plans set out in the table below.

REASON: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved drawings, for the avoidance of doubt.

3. No removal of hedgerows, trees or shrubs brambles, ivy and other climbing plants or works to or demolition of buildings or structures that may be used by breeding birds shall take place between 1st March and 31st August inclusive, unless a competent ecologist has undertaken a careful, detailed check for active birds' nests immediately before the works commence and provided written confirmation that no birds will be harmed and/or that there are appropriate measures in place to protect nesting bird interest on site. Any such written confirmation should be submitted to the local planning authority.

REASON: To ensure that breeding birds are protected. All British birds, their nests and eggs (with certain limited exceptions) are protected by law under Section 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and in accordance with Policy NE1 of the Local Development Plan

4. The development shall be carried out in accordance with Section 6. Required Actions of the submitted Acer Ecology, Hatcham Barn, Monmouth, Bat and Nesting Bird Survey dated October 2018. This shall include mitigation and compensation measures for bats, nesting birds and hedgehog.

REASON: To safeguard protected and priority species in accordance with LDP policy NE1 and Environment Wales Act 2016

5. No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured agreement for a written scheme of historic environment mitigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the local planning authority. Thereafter, the programme of work will be fully carried out in accordance with the requirements and standards of the written scheme.

(A detailed report on the archaeological work, as required by the condition, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority within six months of the completion of the archaeological fieldwork)

REASON: To identify and record any features of archaeological interest discovered during the works, in order to mitigate the impact of the works on the archaeological resource

6. No works to which this consent relates shall commence until an appropriate programme of historic building recording and analysis has been secured and implemented in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority

REASON: As the building is of architectural and cultural significance the specified records are required to mitigate impact.

7. No lighting or lighting fixtures shall be installed on the building or in the curtilage until an appropriate lighting scheme has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing. The strategy shall include:
lighting type, positioning and specification
drawings setting out light spillage in key areas for bats based on technical specifications
The strategy must demonstrate that the roost and key flight lines and foraging areas are not illuminated.
The scheme shall be agreed in writing with the LPA and implemented in full.

REASON: To safeguard roosting and foraging/commuting habitat of Species of Conservation Concern in accordance with LDP policies NE1 and EP3.

8. No surface water from any increase in the roof area of the building /or impermeable surfaces within its curtilage shall be allowed to drain directly or indirectly to the public sewerage system.

REASON: To prevent hydraulic overloading of the public sewerage system, to protect the health and safety of existing residents and ensure no pollution of or detriment to the environment in accordance with Policy EP1 of the Local Development Plan.

9. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1 Classes A B C D E F & H of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(Amendment)(Wales) Order 2013 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no enlargements, improvements or other alterations to the dwelling house or any outbuildings shall be erected or constructed.

REASON: If substantial extensions or alterations were necessary this development would not normally be favourably considered and would be contrary to LDP Policy H4.

10. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(Amendment)(Wales) Order 2013 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no fence, wall or other means of enclosure other than any approved under this permission shall be erected or placed without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity and to safeguard the appearance of the area and to ensure compliance with LDP Policy H4.

11. Prior to the commencement of development details of the means of enclosure shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The agreed details shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the dwellings and shall remain as such in perpetuity.

REASON: To protect the visual amenity of the surrounding area and to protect the amenity of the neighbouring properties and future occupiers of the site in accordance with policy DES1 and EP1 respectively of the Local Development Plan

12. Prior to development commencing on site a Tree Protection Plan shall be submitted identifying how the retained tree shown to east of the site shall be protected during the course of the development. The retained trees shall be protected in accordance with the approved reports and BS5837 Trees in relation to Design, Demolition and Construction Recommendations 2012. This report shall include details of the final positioning of the protective fencing. Where it may become necessary to install temporary access routes within the Root Protection Area (RPA), porous ground protection measures in accordance with BS 5837 must be installed, and again agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The removal of the hard surfacing within the RPA of T1 must be removed using hand tools to avoid damage to surface roots. Any roots thus exposed are to be covered with fresh topsoil.

REASON: In order to protect a landscape feature in accordance with Policy GE1 of the LDP.

13.

INFORMATIVES

Bats and their breeding sites and resting places are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). Where bats are present and a

development proposal is likely to contravene the legal protection they are afforded, the development may only proceed under licence issued by Natural Resources Wales, having satisfied the three requirements set out in the legislation. A licence may only be authorised if:

i. the development works to be authorised are for the purpose of preserving public health or safety, or those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment. ii. There is no satisfactory alternative and iii. The action authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in its natural range.

Paragraph 6.3.7 of Technical Advice Note 5: Nature Conservation and Planning (TAN5) states that your Authority should not grant planning permission without having satisfied itself that the proposed development either would not impact adversely on any bats on the site or that, in its opinion, all three conditions for the eventual grant of a licence are likely to be satisfied.

Please note that close-boarded fencing will not be acceptable in this setting.