

Application Number:	Application 2013/0275 & Listed Building application 2013/0190	Application Type:	Full
Proposal:	Extension to the North Elevation and a Steel Frame & Glazing extension to the south elevation. In addition the proposal includes for the demolition and rebuilding of a glazed link corridor between the Medical Centre and Crawshaw Hall	Location:	Crawshaw Hall Medical Centre, Burnley road, Crawshawbooth BB48LZ
Report of:	Planning Unit Manager	Status:	For Publication
Report to:	Development Control Committee	Date:	03 September 2013
Applicant:	Mr M Karoo Crawshaw Hall Medical Centre	Determination Expiry Date:	13 August 2013
Agent:	The Planningman.co.uk		

Contact Officer:	Stephen Stray	Telephone:	01706-252420
Email:	planning@rossendalebc.gov.uk		

REASON FOR REPORTING	
Outside Officer Scheme of Delegation	
Member Call-In Name of Member: Reason for Call-In:	Cllr A Barnes That the business needs to carry out these works in order to keep pace with demand/ the economic climate and competitors.
3 or more objections received	
Other (please state):	

HUMAN RIGHTS

The relevant provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 and the European Convention on Human Rights have been taken into account in the preparation of this report, particularly the implications arising from the following rights:-

Article 8

The right to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence.

Article 1 of Protocol 1

The right of peaceful enjoyment of possessions and protection of property.

1. **RECOMMENDATION**

To grant Permission subject to the Conditions set out in Section 10 and the provision of a Section 106 Planning Obligation requiring the applicant to prepare a Conservation Management Plan for Crawshaw Hall and rescinding of previous extant consent 2010/0683.

That the Committee give delegated powers for the application to be refused should a Section 106 Obligation not be completed.

2. **SITE**

Crawshaw Hall is situated in the area of Countryside just to the west of Burnley Road (A682), from which it takes access.

Built in the early 1830's as a large house, within extensive grounds, the Hall has been included on the national List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest at Grade II*. It comprises a 2 and 3-storey building of essentially symmetrical design in a Georgian and Gothic style, with embattled turrets. It is now used as a Nursing Home, as too is the 2-storey building to the north of the Hall (known as the annex, consented in 1990 and constructed in 1995).

To the south side of the Hall remains formal garden, in a series of terraces that descend in height with distance from the Hall, beyond which is open land.

3. **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

2013/0199LBC – Temporary removal of 2 stone spires over the south facing garden and subsequent repair and reinstatement – Approved

2011/0440 & 0441LBC- Demolition of existing glazed link & new enlarged link corridor & repositioned closer to the Hall - Approved (with conditions)

2010/683 & 684LBC Addition to annex of third storey with plant room above; 3-storey side extension, internal alteration and remodeling of existing 2-storey glazed link with Crawshaw hall - Approved in 2011, but not yet implemented and the applicant advises that due to current financial constraints the permission cannot be implemented.

2008/664 – Two-storey extension to side & rear of Crawshaw Hall Lodge, with disabled access to rear entrance and formation of adjacent car parking – Refused / Appeal dismissed on 19/08/09

2008/656 Two-storey extension to side & rear of Crawshaw Hall Lodge, with disabled access to rear entrance and formation of adjacent car parking – Refused/Appeal Dismissed -19/08/09

2008/309 Conversion of outbuilding adj Hall to new laundry and kitchen accommodation & construction of single storey link extension – Approved

2006/657LB Erection of a 2 storey side extension to Crawshaw Hall Lodge to provide meeting training facility and accommodation for nursing staff - Withdrawn

2006/622 Erection of 2 storey side extension to Crawshaw Hall Lodge – Withdrawn

2006/188LBC Internal alterations to Crawshaw Hall – Approved

1998/0250 The alteration and conversion of an existing structure to form one dwelling - Approved

1998/0249 Renewal of applications 1993/053 & 1993/054

1997/397 Construction of 2-storey garage to provide garage and garden storage facilities – Withdrawn

1997/ 396 Conversion of attic space to create office area – Approved

1997/395LB Proposed internal alterations to provide individual bedrooms to comply with requirements for health authority registration – Approved

1994/122LB Conservatory link extension- Approved

1994/121 Conservatory link extension - Approved

1993/054 Alterations and conversion of existing structure to create dwelling – Approved

1993/053 Refurbishment and alteration of outbuilding to form residential accommodation – Approved

1993/052 Outline – conversion and extension of existing outbuilding and erection of sheltered and close care apartments – Approved

1991/305LB Replacement of no.5 existing ground floor windows to south elevation – Approved

1989/600 Two storey detached 20-bed extension with glazed link to Crawshaw Hall – Approved by committee contrary to officers' recommendation.

1984/295LB Change of use to private nursing home – Approved

4. PROPOSAL

The applicant proposes extension to the North Elevation and a Steel Frame & Glazing extension to the south elevation of the Annex. In addition the proposal includes for the demolition and rebuilding of a glazed link corridor between the Medical Centre and Crawshaw Hall. The applicant advises the layout of the proposals reflect the fact that apart from the southern elevation the remaining elevations are confined and restricted by the topography. Land to the north can accommodate a small extension. Banking to the west and landscaping currently severely limits the natural light to that side of the building, particularly to the dining area. For this reason the applicant wishes to move the dining area to where the lounge is currently located, create two ensuite bedrooms and a nurses station in place of the original dining room and then create a lounge facing the car park so much more natural light is gained. Above this lounge the applicant proposes two new larger bedrooms suitable for specialist care.

The proposed north extension would be similar to that previously permitted as an element of 2010/0683. The proposals for the glazed link are similar to that approved under

2011/0440. The North extension would be constructed from Ashlar Stone. The southern extension involves glazed construction to maintain the appearance of separation.

The application is supported by a brief Heritage Statement prepared by the applicant himself and an appended brief Heritage statement prepared on a previously submitted application and a Design and Access Statement also undertaken by the applicant. Following a request from officers, the applicant has provided some financial information to support justification of the proposal.

In support of the proposals the applicant advises that the medical centre (known as the annex) built in 1995 is now no longer compliant with regulations in the Health Care Industry. In particular, new bedrooms are required to have a minimum floor area of 12.5m sq and have en-suite facilities. The existing bedrooms are limited to 10.5m sq and have shared toilet facilities. The applicant advises that whilst the original hall (Listed) is at occupation capacity following refurbishment consented in 2007, the annex is currently not.

The applicant advises due to financial constraints he is now unable to implement application 2010/0683 approved by officers and so cannot extend all the bedrooms in the annex but is looking to extend 6 bedrooms and create 2 new bedrooms. The applicant indicates in one part of their supporting statement, the addition of two bedrooms will help maintain business viability particularly as care fees funded by Clinical Commissioning Groups and Local Authorities has been reduced and then frozen to 2015. Elsewhere in the document the applicant indicates the provision of 2 additional bedrooms makes the difference between a viable and non-viable project, greatly improves efficiency of operations and the financial viability of the overall business including maintaining the listed hall. Clarification on this discrepancy will be sought before consideration by committee.

The applicant advises that in formulating the proposals they have liaised with the CQC, various health care professionals / bodies, residents and their families.

The application form indicates that the centre currently employs 33 full time staff and 6 part time staff but with implementation of the scheme this will rise to 42 Full-time employees and 8 part time employees. However the design and access statement states Crawshaw Hall may be taking on additional staff when works are complete, but the main outcome is the safeguarding of 45+ jobs. Accordingly, the job creation potential of the project is unclear on the information submitted, and clarification will be sought from the applicant before consideration by committee.

Whilst the application form and design & access statement indicate 2 new bedrooms are to be created, the layout drawings appear to indicate 3 new bedrooms will be created. Clarification will again be sought from the applicant.

Finally, whilst the application form and design and access statement indicates the glazed link will be pitched, the drawings show it to be flat. Clarification is being sought on which elements will be glazed and which elements will be Zinc panels on the southern extension as this is not clear from the submission.

5. **POLICY CONTEXT**

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

- Section 1 Building a Strong Competitive Economy
- Section 3 Supporting a prosperous rural economy
- Section 4 Promoting Sustainable Transport

Development Plan Policies

Rossendale Core Strategy DPD (2011)

AVP4 Rawtenstall, Crawshawbooth, Goodshaw and Loveclough

Policy 1 General Development Locations and Principles

Policy 4 Affordable and Supported Housing

Policy 8 Transport

Policy 9 Accessibility

Policy 16 Preserving and Enhancing Rossendale's Built Environment

Policy 23 Promoting High Quality Designed Spaces

Policy 24 Planning Application Requirements

6. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Conservation Officer

Summarized comments of the Conservation Officer are set out below: Additional detailed comments are provided in Appendix 1 attached.

SIGNIFICANCE

As a Grade II* building, Crawshaw Hall falls within a very select group representing only 8% of all listed buildings nationally. Being one of only 11 Grade II* buildings within the Borough of Rossendale, Crawshaw Hall has been afforded statutory protection as a result of its exemplary architectural and historic interest and also by virtue of its group value and association with other listed assets within the immediate vicinity, namely the grade II listed Gate Lodge and stone gate piers, also listed in their own right.

PROPOSALS

The Hall, having been made a Listed Building, the Council is required by S.66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, when considering applications for development, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building and its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. National planning policies and Development Plan Policies are consistent with this requirement.

This application for Listed Building Consent and Planning approval requests the demolition of the existing single-storey glazed link and the provision of a new extended two-storey glazed link corridor to include the erection of a two-storey glazed extension to the existing Medical Centre block on its southern elevation and a two-storey sandstone extension to its northern elevation.

The applicant currently has an approved consent for the demolition of the existing glazed link which connects the principal building (the grade II* listed Crawshaw Hall) and the Medical Centre, and for the erection of a new two-storey glazed link in a style similar to the extant structure but in closer proximity to the Hall (application ref: 2011/0440 & 2011/0441). Planning permission has also been previously approved for an additional third storey located on the Medical Centre with plant room above, and for a single storey extension to the north end of the annex (ref: 2010/683 & 2010/684).

The applicant has also previously developed the area around the Medical Centre by installing ramped access to the front (east) of the block and also by constructing a raised decked area (without prior planning approval) to the southern extent of the block, which is now the area proposed for extension.

The applicant is seeking to extend the existing Medical Centre annex block on the south-west corner, providing a new lounge for residents on the ground floor including an additional bedroom and three en-suite rooms and two further bedrooms above. This would be set in a two-storey extension to the south elevation, formed in a steel frame with curtain glazing system of zinc spandrel panels, soffits, fascias and cappings which would mark a departure from the current style of the existing annex block but with a recessed front elevation and reduced height. No detailed designs of the extension and glazed link have been submitted as part of this application. The footprint of the proposed south extension would be in the area of, but extending beyond the area of the current raised timber deck.

The proposed extension of the medical centre annex through the addition of a two-storey glazed link, two-storey glazed extension and two-storey stone extension would increase the capacity of the residential accommodation in the Medical Centre from 21 bedrooms to 24 bedrooms as detailed on the submitted floor plans (and not by two as specified on the application form drawing ref: 003-402(2)). This would create an additional net gross internal floor space of 137msq.

IMPACT

The main considerations of the application are the principle of the development, heritage interest and its impact on visual and neighbour amenity. The proposal to erect an additional extension to the southern aspect of the existing Medical Centre annex adjoining Crawshaw Hall would have a harmful and detrimental impact on the special interest of the grade II* listed building and the setting of this highly designated heritage asset. The current proposals appear contrary to the policies for sustainable development and the Historic Environment set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and in Rossendale Borough Council's Core Strategy and with reference to the case history of the site, would have a further impact as a result of another addition into an already sensitive setting. The cumulative impact of these proposals should be weighed against the policies set out in NPPF Section 12.

The number of previous applications for development in relation the site illustrates the extent of the exterior and interior changes the principal listed building has undergone in order to accommodate its current commercial use as a Nursing Home and Care Centre:

The proposed development would have a direct physical impact on the listed building and therefore requires the submission of a listed building consent application alongside the planning application. More significantly, the proposals have an indirect impact on the listed building in that they further encroach into the setting of the principal building, reducing the current visual separation of the two extant buildings and therefore the visual amenity of the historic building. Responses from LPA Officers and Statutory Consultees on previous planning and listed building consent applications in relation to the construction of the Medical Centre and thereafter the glazed link, have been consistent in expressing their concerns over the cumulative impact these frequent accretions had on the setting and significance of Crawshaw Hall.

Expert advice has consistently raised concerns over the encroachment of these additional structures into the immediate area of the Hall, taking on board the significant internal alterations that the current owners have made to the sensitive Gothic interior of the building. As a result, it is the external shell of the grade II* Hall and its setting which remains the only ‘apparently unchanged’ element of the site. This too has been successively compromised by the needs of the growing business to the extent that what was accepted as ‘necessary’ interventions in order to support the business model (i.e. the construction of the medical centre annex to alleviate pressure on the sensitive interior of the listed building, and the construction of the glazed link extension to provide further living accommodation for guests) was only approved as ‘acceptable’ development on the basis of the absolute needs of the business based on its revenue requirements and CQC standards. It has never been deemed to be ‘appropriate’ development within this context.

The mitigation of the impact for these changes was that some of the revenue would be redirected back into the repair of the principal building and that the detailed design of the Medical Centre annex would allow for a distinct visual separation between the two buildings, being recessed on its southern most extent and stepped back in its footprint. Later, the addition of the single-storey glazed link, albeit further encroaching in the small separation space, was designed as a single-storey building in a traditional design of lightweight timber and glazed materials.

As a result, the concessions that have been made in accepting the previous development proposals have been proved to be unsustainable and have not future-proofed the business nor the buildings. These proposals also appear not to provide for a long-term vision in terms of the needs of the business and the appropriateness and acceptability of interventions at this site.

The applicant was advised to provide a detailed heritage statement and impact assessment in support of the current application. This was in order that consultees could better understand the justification and need for the extended glazed link and the extensions to the north and south of the medical centre annex. This would allow an assessment of the cumulative impact of these developments on the principal listed building. The submitted heritage statement does not adequately make an assessment of the significance of the heritage asset (not even having consulted Lancashire’s Heritage Environment Record as a minimum requirement recommended by NPPF) , nor does it address the impact of the proposals on that significance or adequately justify the need for the impact based on economic, environmental and social grounds. The heritage statement is lacking to the extent that the primary impact, that of the effect of development on the heritage asset, has not been given due regard by the applicant. The basis for the development proposal is purely financial.

ENABLING DEVELOPMENT

If the applicant is citing financial and economic reasons for the extension of the Medical Centre in that it would provide revenue to undertake repairs to the principal listed building then this may form the basis for assessment in terms of Enabling Development, which by definition is contrary to policy. NPPF (para 140) states that local authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal in this case, assessed against the recommended ‘test criteria’ set out in the PPS 5 Practice guide allows for a proposal to be accepted despite its harmful impact.

Owners of historic buildings are advised to employ a regular maintenance regime, ideally based on a conservation management plan (CMP) in order to fulfil the maintenance needs

of the historic building. The CMP should be informed by a thorough condition survey which records the condition of critical element factors and identifies, where possible, building elements which may need repair and conservation work. The owner/ applicant has been advised that he should look to commissioning a CMP and condition survey which would indicate where funds should be focused in the short, medium and long term. Based on this information, the owner could thereafter submit a case for enabling development judged against criteria, but at present there is no indication of a mounting conservation deficit (The cost of maintenance and repair versus the income the use generates plus its capital value) for the principal building, only a mounting repair deficit.

CONCLUSION

Generally, the Council seeks to preserve listed buildings, their settings and any features of architectural or historic interest. We would not normally approve an application to allow alterations that would involve the loss of historic parts of the building; obscure the original plan form, layout or structural integrity; or otherwise diminish the historic value of listed buildings.

The Council also aims to keep listed buildings in their original use, or if this use no longer exists, in another use that causes least harm to the building. Many buildings can sustain some sensitive alterations or extensions to accommodate continuing or new uses however, listed buildings vary greatly in the extent to which they can be changed without harm to their special architectural or historic interest and in this case, I feel that the proposals would have a highly adverse effect on the special interest of one of Rosendale's highly graded designated heritage assets.

Based on the current proposals, the effect of the development on the significance of the asset can be reckoned by its impact through its location and siting; form and appearance; appropriateness; permanence and its as yet unknown additional effects (such as parking, lighting, access and its suitability or 'fit for purpose'). Any proposals in such a highly sensitive context should seek to maximising enhancement and minimising harm. The further cumulative impact through this proposal will not achieve this objective.

English Heritage

Consider the proposal will have a visual impact on the setting of the hall, but this is minor in comparison to the impact of the medical centre as a whole and causes less than substantial harm and therefore should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme. English Heritage also comment on the "Long term Management of Crawshaw Hall" and state: *"We feel that an essential tool for the future care of Crawshaw Hall is a Conservation Management Plan. This document would help you to understand the significance of the hall; conservation requirements and costs as well as developing a strategy for the future management of the hall. It would help those advising on changes to the hall and its setting in the future to understand impact and inform decision making."*

There is a concern that the development of the medical centre has not had a long term strategic direction. If you created a long term plan of future growth and change that you consult all stakeholders about you would allay many of these concerns.

We welcome the continued use of Crawshaw Hall and believe that the harm caused by the extension to the medical centre is outweighed by the benefits of keeping the hall in viable use. We recommend acceptance of this application on the proviso that all design detail is agreed with your conservation officer.

We urge you to address the above issues, and recommend that this application be determined in accordance with national and local policy, and on the basis of your expert conservation advice”

Georgian Group

No response

Rossendale Civic Trust

Expresses concern that it is a very poor application given the Grade 2* listing of the property and does not give enough detail in the relationship of the proposals to the main building, nor can the solution to the problem of circulation, the reasons for the proposals, be deciphered from the drawings. There is also a lack of detail on the connection point of the annex to the main building and for these reasons the trust is surprised that the application was validated given the lack of detail in the submission. The Trust considers the existing annex is already a very poor building which does no justice to the listed hall, and they regret the lost opportunity to make improvements. Any extension to the existing bulk will make the situation worse. It considers the Heritage Statement weak and there is no evidence that other design options have been fully explored. They regret lax control of listed building consent in the past has created the situation. Whilst acknowledging that there may be marginal benefits in terms of some job creation and public benefit, it is generally felt that the increased harm to the setting of the listed building outweighs these concerns.

LCC (Highways)

I would raise no objection to the above application on highway grounds.

The parking standards require 1 parking space per 5 residents. There are 24 bedrooms and assuming that they are single rooms, 5 parking spaces are required.

7. NOTIFICATION RESPONSES

To accord with the General Development Procedure Order site notices were posted on the 24/6/2013 and 9 letters were sent to the relevant neighbours on 24/6/2013.

No letters of objection have been received from neighbours.

8. ASSESSMENT

The main considerations of the application are:

- 1) Principle; 2) Visual Amenity; 3) Neighbour Amenity and 4) Access/Parking

Principle

Crawshaw Hall lies in the countryside outside the urban boundary. National Planning Policy Framework in its Introduction section sets out that the development plan should be the starting point for determination of applications. NPPF Section 3 supports sustainable growth and expansion of businesses in rural areas through conversion and good design. Policy 1 of the Core Strategy states development should take place in the urban boundary unless it has to be located in the countryside.

In this respect, whilst Crawshaw Hall is in the countryside, however, it is on a main transport corridor and it is considered due to its position and the siting of the proposals that they will not erode the essentially open and rural character of the countryside. Accordingly, in this respect it is considered the proposal is acceptable in principle.

Section 6 of the NPPF supports delivering a wide choice of high quality homes and policy 4 the Core Strategy actively supports proposals, particularly for elderly accommodation and care provision for those with physical disabilities, learning disabilities and mental health needs.

Accordingly, in this respect, it is considered the proposal is acceptable in principle in this respect.

In respect of the “in principle” issues related to Good Design and the Enhancing and Conserving of the Historic Environment, these are addressed in Sections 7 and 12 of the NPPF and in policies 1, 23, 24 and 16 of the adopted Core Strategy. The relevant detailed wording is referred to in the consultation response from the Council’s Conservation Officer in Appendix 1. However, it is clear that it is on these issues tensions lie as to the level of harm caused by the proposals and the justification / lack of justification made for them.

The Council’s Conservation Officer is of the view that these proposals cause substantial harm to or loss of a designated heritage asset and that a clear and convincing justification for the proposals has not been made. Furthermore, the Conservation Officer is concerned at how apparent adhoc and incremental development has taken place over time on the site. The Conservation officer is concerned at how this apparently unplanned approach has harmed the asset and how this concern may continue should the unplanned approach continue. These concerns are echoed also by Rossendale Civic Trust.

In relation to English Heritage, they too agree the proposal will have a visual impact, but consider this impact minor in comparison to the annex as a whole and therefore the proposal causes less than substantial harm and therefore should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme. English Heritage also believes continued use of the hall and it being kept in viable use outweighs the harm by the proposal. English Heritage and the Council’s Conservation Officer, both agree that there has not been a long term strategic direction for growth and see the need for a Conservation Management Plan as an essential tool for the future care of the Hall.

In relation to the above, through pre-app meetings and other correspondence, the applicant has been convinced by officers to provide more detailed drawings and images to support understanding of the application. However, the applicant has not been convinced of the need to provide all of the information requested. The applicant has not in officers’ opinion undertaken a detailed and adequate heritage impact statement and has not been willing to seek professional support to do so, citing costs as the reason. Instead he has relied heavily on business viability arguments related to national reductions in care fees and the need to meet revised CQC requirements. The applicant also emphasises in his view that the proposal still does not impact on the proposal to an unacceptable degree.

Officers’ have sought from the applicant viability information (confidential) to support the applicant’s case and have asked the applicant to further justify that other less intrusive design solutions do not provide the viability required. Whilst the applicant has provided some viability information, this has only related to income changes from fees over recent years. Data has not been provided on operating costs, nor has he provided a breakdown of return from the principal building and the annex separately versus their costs. Finally, no indication of required

profit margin has been given. These elements would normally be required to establish the viability arguments being put forward by the applicant are robust.

That said, I am mindful that officers wish for the business to be successful and for the main listed building to remain in use and for maintenance and repair to take place. I am also mindful of the views of English Heritage that in their view the proposal does not result in 'substantial harm'.

Having regard to all of the above it is considered that whilst the development will cause harm, I do not consider it to be so substantial as to recommend refusal given the other potential benefits of the scheme and policies supportive of such proposals in general. However, as both English Heritage and the Council's Conservation Officer both highlight, there is a need for future long term management so that the heritage asset can be protected for future generations. Accordingly, I do consider the preparation of a detailed and independently prepared Conservation Management Plan is essential in consideration of the balance on the harmful impact of these proposals.

Visual Amenity

In this respect, consideration needs to be given to the impact on the visual amenity of the setting to the Grade 2* listed hall. Consideration is also needed as to whether the proposal constitutes "Good Design".

The Conservation Officer is concerned by inconsistencies in the proposals and a lack of detail making it hard undertake a comprehensive assessment. In particular it is not clear if the glazed link will be pitched or flat. It is also not clear which elements will be glazed and which elements will be Zinc panels on the southern extension or what the plinth will be made of.

Concern is further heightened by the Heritage Impact Statement which fails to properly assess the impact of the proposals on the setting of the listed hall. Concern also comes from the apparent continuation of the filling in of the separation between hall and annex once argued by the applicant as an important positive in support of the development of the Annex. This view is particularly important from the entrance drive and so will be seen by staff and visitors.

Finally, assessment must be made of the design form and materials used particularly in relation to the southern elevation. In this respect, Council officers have sought more to ask the applicant to explore alternative design solutions to avoid the need for an extension on the southern elevation. However, English Heritage appear content with some filling in of the gap and reduction in the visual separation between hall and annex providing the proposal is of lightweight construction appearance and of modern materials so it does not seek to be a pastiche and reads as a new extension. However, they have left the precise detail as to how this may look as a matter between the applicant and the Council.

In this respect, the Council's Conservation Officer remains concerned as to how the differing materials will appear and whether the design will give a rather Unitarian appearance and that its form overall will not appear lightweight due to the flat and solid elements brought into it, whilst the introduction of wire glass glazing could result in a modern yet dated appearance.

Having regard to all of the above, at the present time some concerns remain as to how the southern extension will appear. However, it is considered that with clarification on some of the inconsistencies and missing information in the update report and appropriate conditioning so that Officers can agree a scheme. In light of this fact, the proposal which does appear subordinate to the annex and the hall could still achieve a light weight modern constructed

appearance which in light of the comments from English Heritage would not appear so detrimental as to warrant refusal.

Neighbour Amenity

No objections from neighbouring residents have been received and due to existing landscaping around the site and the hall and annex set back appearance behind trees, it is not considered the proposals will impact on neighbours. The applicant has indicated the residents and their families of the care home have informed their considerations, and in terms of room requirements, the proposals will result in some improvements.

There is concern as to how the southern extension will function given the materials proposed in terms of privacy and in terms of resulting in an environment too hot in the summer and too cool in winter. In this respect, future occupiers and their families will be able to consider these issues before moving in and there may be internal design solutions which address any issues.

Accordingly, it is not considered the proposals result in an unacceptable detriment to neighbour amenity.

Section 106 Planning Obligation

It is considered that in light of the concerns expressed by English Heritage and the Conservation Officer of the need for a Conservation Management Plan to direct a proper long term strategy for care of the hall in the future, a Section 106 obligation is necessary and relevant in relation to these current proposals. The Obligation will require the preparation of a CMP prior to commencement of development unless otherwise first agreed with the Council. In order for this plan to be prepared a full condition survey of the Grade 2* listed hall and separate listed elements is also required. It is also considered that a business plan would be an important aid to informing the CMP.

General guidance on the preparation of condition surveys has been prepared by English Heritage and guidance on the requirements of a Conservation Management Plan are provided in some detail by good practice documents prepared by the Prince's Trust and Scottish Heritage.

Given the importance of the listed hall, it is considered that the preparation of the Condition Survey and the CMP documents should be done by an independent and suitably qualified person agreed with by both parties to undertake the work, the cost of the work to be borne by the applicant.

There is also concern that there are a a number of extant consents currently in place including application 2010/0683 which includes elements of the scheme now before the Council. Without appropriate control, the applicant could commence the different schemes and effectively "mix and match" between them which cumulatively could result in a great development and more harmful impact than any one individual consent. The applicant has indicated a willingness to rescind consent on application 2010/0683. However, whilst this may have been put in writing, without adherence being required by way of a Section 106 obligation, it is considered the Council's ability to prevent over development through extant consents would be limited.

Highway Safety

No objections.

9. SUMMARY REASON FOR APPROVAL

The proposed development is outside the urban boundary, but it is considered that due to it being on a main transport corridor and its position and the siting of the proposals that they will not erode the essentially open and rural character of the countryside. Furthermore, it is considered the business use is appropriate and is supported by the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy 4. Whilst it is considered the proposal will cause visual harm to the setting of the Grade 2* listed Crawshaw Hall, it is considered this harm is not so substantial as to outweigh the potential benefits the proposal could bring and therefore subject to the provision of a Section 106 Obligation, the proposal is considered to be in general accordance with Sections 3, 6,7 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Core Strategy Policies 1, 4, 8,9,16,23 and 24.

10. RECOMMENDATION

That Permission be granted subject to the Conditions set out below and a Section 106 Obligation being completed.

That officers have the authority to refuse the application in the event that by the 30th November 2013, the Section 106 has not been completed in a satisfactory form.

Conditions

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

Reason: To accord with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the drawings ???? (To be confirmed in the update report subject to clarification of apparent inconsistencies in the current drawings)

Reason: To accord with the permission sought.

3. That notwithstanding what is stated on the application forms and approved drawings samples of the facing and roofing materials for the proposed extensions to be used in the development hereby approved shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for their prior approval in writing.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to accord with policies 16, 23 and 24 of the Council's Core Strategy DPD (2011)

4. Any construction works associated with the development hereby approved shall not take place except between the hours of 7.00am and 7.00pm Monday to Friday and 8.00am to 1.00pm on Saturdays. No construction shall take place on Sundays, Good Friday, Christmas Day or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of neighbours, in accordance with policy 24 of the Council's Core Strategy DPD (2011).