
From: Rob Duncan <rob78duncan@gmail.com>
Sent: 06 September 2017 08:56
To: West 2
Subject: Planning Inspectorate APP/B3438/W/17/3177540: Old Furnace Farm, Greendale, ST10 3AP
Attachments: Supplementary Comments (Old Furnace Farm) v2.pdf

Dear Ann

Thank you for your recent email regarding the above site. I would be grateful if you would find attached some supplementary comments in response to the Local Authority's Statement of Case.

Kind Regards

Rob

From: <west2@pins.gsi.gov.uk>
Date: Tuesday, 29 August 2017 at 10:12
To: Rob Duncan <rob@robduncanplanning.co.uk>
Subject: Planning Inspectorate APP/B3438/W/17/3177540: Old Furnace Farm, Greendale, ST10 3AP

The Planning Inspectorate (England)
Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN

The Planning Inspectorate (Wales)
Crown Buildings, Cathays Park, Cardiff, CF10 3NQ

<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/planninginspectorate>

Twitter: [@PINSgov](https://twitter.com/PINSgov)

This communication does not constitute legal advice.
Please view our [Information Charter](#) before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.

Correspondents should note that all communications to or from the Planning Inspectorate may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for lawful purposes.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been scanned by Websense Email Security Gateway for the presence of computer viruses.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS

OLD FURNACE FARM, OAKAMoor

SEPTEMBER 2017

1 Response to Local Authority Statement of Case

- 1.1 The Local Authority comments that the building is of little architectural interest and the building is not of sufficient character to be considered worthy of conversion. I would reiterate in this regard that the provisions of this policy are in conflict with paragraph 55 of the NPPF which imposes no requirements for buildings to be worthy in architectural and character terms for conversion. Such conflict serves to reduce the weight that should be afforded to the provisions of policy R2 in this regard, and automatically precludes any creative or thoughtful proposals that could enhance the character of an area from coming forward.
- 1.2 The Local Authority contends in paragraph 6.4 that the works proposed go beyond what could reasonably be called a conversion and amounts to significant extension and alterations. I disagree, and submit that aside from replacing the roof and the insertion of two windows, the proposal is a conversion of what currently exists. No 'extension' is proposed, rather the application encompasses the infill of an existing opening to form bedroom 2. As set out within the Grounds of Appeal, it is submitted that the alteration of the building is not contrary to the Development Plan in any event.
- 1.3 In response to the comments at paragraphs 6.5 and 6.6 we submit that the proposal will enhance the character and appearance of the countryside by increasing the pitch of the roof to enable the provision of traditional Staffordshire Blue plain clay tiles, removing the existing poor quality blockwork stable building attached to the barn, and replacing the poor quality outbuilding with a traditionally proportioned double garage. The Parish Council, in their response to the application, acknowledges such improvements.

- 1.4 The comments raised in paragraph 6.7 relate to the previous grant of planning permission for this building to be converted to holiday lets. However, the point I am making in paragraph 5.5 of the Grounds of Appeal is that the Local Authority deemed the building to be worthy in physical, architectural and character terms for its conversion into holiday lets at that time, yet are now resistant to the proposal. I would also reiterate our belief that this proposal will serve to enhance the character and appearance of the surrounding area, whereas the Local Authority take the differing view.

2 List of Suggested Conditions

- 2.1 There are no objections in principle to the suggested conditions set out by the Local Authority. I would however question the need for the contamination report (Condition 14 refers) as the building has only ever been used for agricultural purposes. It is requested that an alternative wording be utilised in this respect, along the following lines:

“If any contamination is encountered during the proposed works, works shall cease immediately and a site risk assessment and remediation strategy be undertaken. The remediation strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented in accordance with the approved details. Following completion of the measures identified in the approved remediation scheme and prior to bringing the development into first use, a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority”.