



Appeal Decisions

Site Visit made on 20 April 2021

by A J Mageean BA(Hons), BPI, PhD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 June 2021

Appeal A, APP/K0235/W/20/3255478

Priory Farm Bedford Road, Turvey, BEDFORD, MK43 8BE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs B Nichol against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00390/FUL, dated 19 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is conversion of granary barn, stable block and piggery unit to create 3 further dwellings on site, conversion of outbuilding to car port and storage building, proposed parking for the existing farmhouse and ancillary works.
-

Appeal B, APP/K0235/Y/20/3255480

Priory Farm Bedford Road, Turvey, BEDFORD, MK43 8BE

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs B Nichol against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00391/LBC, dated 19 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2020.
 - The works proposed are conversion of granary barn, stable block, and piggery unit to create 3 further dwellings on the site, conversion of outbuilding to car port and storage building, proposed parking for the existing farmhouse and ancillary works.
-

Appeal A Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion granary barn, stable block and piggery unit to create 3 further dwellings on site, conversion of outbuilding to car port and storage building, proposed parking for the existing farmhouse and ancillary works at Priory Farm Bedford Road, Turvey, BEDFORD, MK43 8BE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00390/FUL, dated 19 February 2019, [and the plans submitted with it], subject to the conditions listed in the attached schedule.

Appeal B Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for conversion granary barn, stable block and piggery unit to create 3 further dwellings on site, conversion of outbuilding to car port and storage building, proposed parking for the existing farmhouse and ancillary works at Priory Farm Bedford Road, Turvey, BEDFORD, MK43 8BE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00391/LBC, dated 19 February 2019, [and the plans submitted with it], subject to the conditions listed in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Council confirmed that the most recent plans were the ones on which it made its decisions, rather than the earlier versions listed in the decision notices. I have therefore used the most up to date plans as the basis for my decisions.

Main Issues

4. It is logical and more concise to consider the planning and listed building consent appeals together. Therefore, I consider the main issues to be:
 - The effect of the proposal on the special interest and significance of the listed buildings and their setting;
 - Whether sufficient information has been submitted to enable an assessment of the effect of the proposal on highway safety in the vicinity of the appeal site;
 - Whether it has been demonstrated that the biodiversity of the site would be protected, and a net biodiversity gain achieved; and,
 - Whether the countryside location of the site would be a suitable location for a development of this nature.

Reasons

Heritage impacts

5. The Farmhouse (plot 1) and adjoining barn, referred to as 'the stables' (plot 4), are listed as a mid-19thC house and barn, though the Heritage Statement suggests that they date from at least the 18thC, at which time they appear to have been of simpler form with a lower pitched roof. The suggested mid-19thC remodelling to give the current appearance, including a steeply pitched roof of red clay tiles, distinctive chimney stacks and stone buttresses to the southern elevation, bear the hallmarks of buildings dating from this period, as seen elsewhere in Turvey. The Farmhouse itself has significant evidential and local historical value, as well as having considerable aesthetic value as a fine building of some prominence locally.
6. As the stables are continuous with the Farmhouse the exterior is of complementary aesthetic and evidential value. This building appears to have been converted from barn to stable and cart shed use, again as part of the mid-19thC remodelling, with arched brickwork for the cart openings. Internally the western side of the building has retained a substantial oak frame structure, possibly associated with its use as a barn, and timber stables as well as tiled flooring. I understand that a similar roof structure exists within the loft area above the eastern side. The interior therefore provides further evidential and historic value.
7. The piggery (plot 3) is a single storey building abutting the stables and is similarly constructed from coursed limestone rubble. Whilst not referred to in the list description, it is contiguous with the stables and so is considered to be part of the listed structure. Whilst also having 18thC origins, this building has been extensively remodelled, including the movement of the eastern wall, the uncharacteristic half-timbered panel on the western wall and the replacement of the steeply pitched roof with the current mono-pitched configuration of

corrugated sheeting. The internal arrangement of low timber stalls relates to the 20thC use as a pig shed. Whilst of some evidential value in terms of the evolution of the farm and as one side of the courtyard, the extensive alterations mean that this building is of limited historic or aesthetic value.

8. The barn, referred to as 'the granary' (plot 2) is of complementary form, scale and materials to the Farmhouse, though with modest detailing. It is considered to be curtilage listed and is of aesthetic and evidential/historic value as a significant farm building associated with a relatively high-status farmhouse. Whilst its masonry walls may be of 17th or 18thC origin, it is clear that they have undergone considerable repair, and that the eastern gable was rebuilt in brick sometime in the 20thC. Ground floor timber partitions remain. Its first floor, accessed directly by the staircase from the front door, has low head room and could have been an early adaptation. It has a substantial oak frame and clasped purlin roof structure that could be original. These internal features are of further evidential and historic value.
9. The single storey building attached to the granary reflects the fact that a structure appears in this position on early maps. It is partly stone built but is mostly of 20thC construction. A further detached outbuilding is located on the western side of the courtyard which may contain some pre-19thC fabric, though it looks to have been remodelled into what appear to be garages. Both structures are of some evidential/historic significance as part of the farmstead and assist in enclosing the courtyard.
10. The Farmhouse and associated buildings arranged around an enclosed central courtyard are clearly appreciable and contribute to the evidential significance of the farmstead grouping. The visible presence of the large contemporary farm building directly to the north does somewhat moderate this value. Overall, the special interest and significance of the appeal structures lies to a large degree in their historic, evidential and to some degree aesthetic values as agricultural buildings in their own right, and in terms of the communal and functional relationship they have with the Farmhouse.
11. The appeal proposals would create three further dwellings, in addition to the Farmhouse. The external appearance of plot 4, the stables, would be largely retained, with the cart openings glazed to serve the main living space. Two of the three further roof lights added to the northern elevation would be larger than those existing, though no larger than those on the adjacent Farmhouse. Whilst this would create some additional visual clutter and harm the aesthetic value of this elevation, the overall modest appearance of the roofscape, particularly the uncorrupted nature of the more prominent southern elevation, would be retained. Furthermore, the rooflights would not appear out of place when viewed alongside those of the Farmhouse itself, and any visibility from the footpath to the northwest would be limited. The replacement of the stable door with a solid timber framed door would add slightly to the overall modest harm to aesthetic and evidential values of the exterior.
12. Internally, the insertion of a mezzanine floor over part of the western half of the stables would result in the loss of ability to appreciate part of the volume of the space and of the roof structure, though the full height would be retained for the far western portion, including the entrance lobby. The proposal would result in the loss of historic fabric, including the horse stalls, the blue clay flooring and drainage channels, as well as some loss of the open character of

the western side. Insulation for domestic habitation would be required, though details have not been provided and it is suggested that these could be required by condition. It has therefore not been demonstrated that the scheme would not harm the ability to appreciate internal features including the roof structure. As a result, my view is that there would be some modest harm to the evidential and historic value of the interior of the stables.

13. The conversion of the piggery, plot 3, would involve the replacement of the mono-pitch roof with a pitched roof of similar proportions to that existing in the late 19th/early 20thC. Three rooflights would be added to the eastern roof slope, facing away from the courtyard, and one to the west. The external wall to the east would be rebuilt along the line of the original wall and would include a series of large glazed openings. Whilst the domestication of this elevation would not be consistent with the origins of these buildings as modest farm structures, there is little or no visibility of this elevation from the road to the south-east, with the resulting degree of harm being limited. On the western elevation the retention of the half timber panel would be a neutral element. The internal alterations would be of limited consequence to heritage values.
14. The eastern range of the granary building would be replaced with a larger structure with a ridge height slightly lower than the granary itself. This would result in the loss of the rear wall which may be original, imparting some limited heritage harm. Whilst this range would appear as a substantial structure, due to its separation from the main building by a lower recessed link, its lower height and the contemporary appearance of the fenestration on its southern elevation, it would appear as a distinct and secondary element when viewed against the greater presence and more refined features of the main building.
15. The eastern gable of the main granary building would be reconstructed in stone. The visual impact of this improvement would be moderated somewhat by the substantial degree of glazing on the eastern elevation of the new range. This would be visible in glimpsed views from the road, though the presence of the large building to the rear would continue to be the dominant element.
16. With the exception of the enlargement of the northern rooflight, the simple and modest external appearance of the granary as essentially an agrarian structure would be retained. Internally, the ground floor partitions would be removed and the space reconfigured, including the repositioning of the staircase and the lowering of the western end. This would result in some modest harm to evidential and historic value. The open character of the proposed plan living area at first floor would remain. Whilst the low headroom and retention of the principal tie beams may restrict the usability of this space, it would be secondary to the main ground floor kitchen/living space in the eastern part of the dwelling. As such there would be lesser pressure to be able to fully utilise this space. As with the stables, the introduction of insulation would have the potential to cause further minor harm to the ability to appreciate internal features, particularly the roof structure.
17. The courtyard would be reconfigured to create modest garden and parking areas for the plots 2 and 4. This subdivision would erode the sense of this being a central communal space, impacting on the setting of the listed structures. Nonetheless, the garden area associated with plot 4 would be the only significant incursion into this space, with a large proportion of the central and northern area remaining generally accessible and providing a substantially

open setting for the listed structures, a feature which would be controlled further by the restriction of permitted development rights in relation to the curtilage of listed buildings. As such any harm to the setting of the designated heritage asset would be minor.

18. Pulling this analysis together, I have found that the special interest and significance of the Farmhouse and associated buildings relates to their assemblage as a traditional farmstead, as well as the architectural interest of individual buildings. The proposed internal and external alterations would cause modest harm to the heritage significance and special interest of the exterior and interior of the stables, and modest harm to the interior of the granary. Further limited and minor harm has been found in relation to the piggery and the courtyard area. Nonetheless, the proposal would retain the integrity of the grouping as a whole. As such I find that, even considered cumulatively, this harm to significance must be considered as less than substantial, with reference to paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
19. In considering whether to grant listed building consent for works to a listed building, or development which would affect the setting of listed buildings, the decision maker is required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the buildings and their settings, and the features of special architectural or historic interest that they possess. Paragraph 193 of the Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to its conservation.
20. The Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030 (the LP) Policy 41S reflects the Framework paragraph 196 in stating that where a development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm will be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use (OVU).
21. Turning to these matters, in relation to OVU the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) sets out that *'If there is only one viable use, that use is the optimum viable use. If there is a range of alternative economically viable uses, the optimum viable use is the one likely to cause the least harm to the significance of the asset.....The optimum viable use may not necessarily be the most economically viable one.'* I understand that a previously saved policy also referred to the fact that residential uses tend not to be the most appropriate for traditional farm buildings. However the details and status of this policy are not before me. Notwithstanding this point, adaptation to other leisure or commercial uses would not be without their challenges. For example, whilst office uses may require less internal sub-division, they generally require more parking and better road access than residential.
22. Whilst these buildings may not be at immediate risk of loss or further harm, their recent underuse has contributed to their decline and there is a need to secure an active viable use. The Council suggests that storage or parking use may be considered, though there is no evidence before me to indicate that such a conversion could be successfully achieved and would secure the long-term future of these buildings. The previous approval over 20 years ago for holiday let accommodation was not implemented. The more recent pre-application advice for a similar conversion, which indicated that this proposal

was not considered an inherently good match, was not progressed. Under these circumstances it does not appear to me that there are a range of alternative viable uses for these buildings. As such the fact that the current scheme would achieve the long-term future of these buildings, preventing their further deterioration, can be regarded as a public benefit of moderate weight.

23. Specific heritage related benefits include the rebuilding of the eastern gable wall of the granary, replacing the current brick with stone, thereby restoring the rustic character of this structure. I give this benefit moderate weight. Similarly, the reinstatement of the steeply pitched roof to the piggery would assist in restoring both the views of the grouping from the A428, and the sense of enclosure of the courtyard. I also give this benefit moderate weight. The site as a whole has a somewhat neglected air and would benefit from improvements to the setting of the buildings. Whilst details of the hard and soft landscaping plans are sketchy at this stage, a scheme of suitably robust and modest character could be achieved by condition. This benefit would be of modest weight. Furthermore, my view is also that whilst the scheme would result in some modest and limited harms, it would in overall heritage terms protect the integrity and identity of the farmstead as a whole, a matter to which I give moderate weight.
24. Wider social and economic benefits associated with a small-scale housing scheme in a semi-rural location, including adding three units to housing supply, are public benefits of moderate weight.
25. When the less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets and their setting is considered against the public and heritage benefits, the benefits identified are collectively are of sufficient weight to warrant a conclusion that the balance lies in favour of the appeal proposal. I reach this view having fully recognised the considerable importance and weight to be given to the protection of designated heritage assets.
26. For these reasons I conclude that, as less than substantial heritage harm would be outweighed by public benefits, the proposals considered as a whole would protect the special interest and significance of the listed buildings and their settings. In this regard the requirements of statute and of Policy 41S would be met. Policy 41S also refers (at point v.) to a range of factors to be included in the consideration of heritage impacts, the relevant aspects of which have been incorporated into my analysis above. The Council also refers to LP Policies 7S and 6S which are considered in the final section below. Finally, the scheme would also support the requirement of Policy T9 of the emerging Turvey Neighbourhood Development Plan. This requires that in considering the impact of development on heritage assets particular regard should be had to the setting of Priory Farmhouse and associated barn.

Highways impacts

27. The access to the site is within the 40mph zone of the A428, though close to the transition to 60mph. This access currently serves Priory Farm and Great Oakes Farm. The Council's highway adviser has confirmed that the development would not represent a significant intensification of the use of the existing farm access over the previously consented holiday let use, or potentially any commercial farm use. As such the access is not considered unsafe. However, visibility to the east of the access is impeded by the slight curve in the road and the existing conifer hedge/boundary wall, thereby

creating a visibility limitation for when westbound vehicles overtake each other approaching the farm access.

28. As a result, the Council has requested either a traffic survey to demonstrate that current speeds at the 85th percentile are consistent with the 40mph speed limit, or a commitment to traffic calming measures. Neither have been provided, though the appellant refers to a recent application for 30 dwellings relating to land to the east of Priory Farm. A submitted speed survey indicates actual A428 vehicle percentile speeds of 49mph for westbound traffic and 46mph for eastbound traffic. Whilst the proposed traffic calming measures, including an average speed camera system and a reduction in speed limits, would be likely to result in speed reductions, the status of this proposal is unclear and so such considerations are of limited weight. Further, the off-site highway improvements conditioned as part of the retirement village currently under construction at Station End appear to relate largely to improvements to the A428/Station Road junction, some distance to the east of Priory Farm, and would therefore have little impact on traffic speeds/road safety associated with the current scheme.
29. Nonetheless, there is no dispute that the modest scale of the appeal scheme means that the number of additional vehicles using this point of access would be limited, estimated by the appellant's traffic report to be around 2 trips per hour in peak hours. Consideration of the visibility to the east of the access point indicates that, whilst somewhat below generally accepted standards, the low level of the boundary wall at the furthest point in view to the east does provide reasonably open and clear visibility of this corner. Therefore, whilst the A428 is a busy thoroughfare, my view is that the additional use of this point of access would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, even considering the cumulative effects with current farm use.
30. I therefore conclude that sufficient information has been submitted to enable an assessment of the effect of the proposal on highway safety in the vicinity of the appeal site. In this respect it would not be in conflict with Policy 31 of the LP which requires that development proposals should not have any significant adverse impacts on access to the public highway, and that particular attention should be given to, amongst other things, highway safety.

Biodiversity

31. The applications were accompanied by a Bat Survey, the results of which confirmed that there is evidence of brown long eared bats in the granary, the stables and the piggery. It acknowledges that without mitigation measures the proposed development would be likely to result in disturbance of bats and loss of bat roosting sites. Bats are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. As such, both careful evaluation of the effects of the proposal and effective mitigation measures are required.
32. Section 8 of the Bat Survey describes the requirement to obtain a development licence prior to any action affecting bats or their roosting sites. It then describes mitigation measures, including a preliminary inspection by a licensed ecologist and the approach required to the removal of roof coverings and the treatment of timbers. It also sets out measures which could be used to maintain and enhance the bat population at the site, including through the

retention and replacement of bat access points and the use of purpose-built bat roosting boxes.

33. These suggested mitigation and enhancement measures capture approaches to both protecting and enhancing the existing population on site. This, along with the provision of further details by condition, means that the requirement of Policy 42S for mitigation to reduce any adverse effects on protected species, and Policy 43, requiring that proposals provide a net increase in biodiversity through the creation of new habitats or the enhancement of existing features on site, could be met. Whilst the details provided may not be as full as those relating to the retirement village scheme, it appears that this would be a proportionate response to the proposals before me. I therefore conclude that it has been demonstrated that the biodiversity of the site would be protected, and a net biodiversity gain could be achieved, consistent with both policy and legislation on this matter.

Location

34. The appeal site is located outside the Settlement Policy Area of Turvey, which is around 1km to the west. It is more closely related to the Small Settlement of Station End, though as it is located some 100m to the west and on the opposite side of the A428 it does not relate closely to the built form of this settlement. As such for policy purposes the site is located within the open countryside.
35. LP Policy 3S sets out the spatial strategy to deliver sustainable development within the borough and includes the requirement to safeguard the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside through the careful management of development. More specifically, LP Policy 7S sets out that in specific circumstances development will be permitted if it is appropriate in the countryside in accordance with a number of policies (as set out in criteria i. to v.), including Policy 65 – Reuse of rural buildings. Whilst the Council's officer report suggests that each of the criteria i. to v. must be met for development to be acceptable, the statement of case recognises these to be five specific circumstances in which development may be acceptable, subject to three overarching criteria (points xi. to xiii.).
36. Policy 7S further identifies that *'in addition, exceptionally development proposals will be supported on sites that are well related to a defined Settlement Policy Area, Small Settlements or the built form of other settlements'* where it can be demonstrated that a range of other criteria relating to community need and support are met (as set out in criteria vi. to x.). As such, Policy 7S sets out that where specific policy provisions which support countryside development are not met, there is still the possibility that development could be acceptable. It does not suggest that the requirements of *both* sets of criteria must be met for development to be deemed acceptable, rather that development may still be acceptable in accordance with the further criteria vi. to x., even where criteria i. to v. are not met.
37. Policy 65 concerns buildings which are redundant or disused or underused and sets out a series of criteria which must be met. Of those disputed, my view is that the first, 65 i., whether the buildings are redundant or disused, is reasonably met, in that whilst the stables are in partial use for what appears to be domestic storage this is clearly a subsidiary element of the main

Farmhouse. This does not undermine the fact that the majority of structures are disused.

38. Turning to the remaining criteria considered by the Council to be in breach, 65 vi. requires the buildings to be inherently suitable, in terms of size, design and construction for the intended re-use, without the need for complete or substantial reconstruction. As the heritage section has demonstrated, whilst the scheme would involve some adaptation and the reconstruction of the eastern range of the granary, the suitability of the conversion is demonstrated by the fact that the buildings themselves would remain largely intact, retaining their overall form and appearance. The works would not approach the substantial reconstruction threshold.
39. Criterion 65 vii. requires the proposal to lead to an enhancement of the immediate setting. In this regard, whilst I have concluded less than substantial harm to the listed structures, there is no doubt that the current run down and neglected appearance of some of the buildings, particularly noting the granary and the piggery, would be addressed by the appeal scheme, such that an overall visual enhancement of the site and its immediate context would be achieved. On a similar point in relation to 65 viii., whilst the increase in height of the eastern range of the granary would be visible in glimpsed views from the A428, this would not significantly increase the visual impact of the site or its use on the surrounding countryside.
40. Turning to 65 ix., and the requirement that any curtilage required is not excessive and should relate well to the existing building and landscape, my view is that the garden areas identified would be relatively modest, well related to their host dwellings and contained within the local landscape. Whilst I have found minor heritage harm in relation to the erosion of the courtyard space, my view is that the general requirement of 65 ix. would be met.
41. The requirement of criterion 65 x. and 65 xi. in relation to heritage and biodiversity policy (Policies 41S and 42S) have been reviewed in previous sections. My findings in these regards are of direct relevance and indicate compliance with these requirements.
42. As the requirements of Policy 65 would be met, I find that the proposal would meet one of the five specific circumstances in which development in the countryside is deemed to be acceptable in accordance with Policy 7S. Turning to the three overarching criteria (points xi. to xiii.), I am satisfied that given the nature of the proposal in seeking to protect the characteristic qualities of this traditional farmstead and the modest scale of the development overall, it would both recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and not give rise to other impacts that would adversely affect the enjoyment of the countryside by others. Further, given my findings in relation to biodiversity, it would not have an adverse effect on the environment, biodiversity or Natura 2000 sites.
43. Nonetheless, I have also given some consideration to the wider locational issues raised by the Council. The site is not isolated as it is within easy walking distance of the settlement of Station End, including the new facilities to be provided as part of the retirement village scheme. Whilst it will be sometime before the facilities here are completed, it is not unreasonable to assume that this would coincide with the implementation of the appeal scheme.

44. The site is around 1km from the defined Settlement Policy Area of Turvey, and the modest services and facilities located there. Whilst the route along the A428 is busy and unlit, it includes a cycle/footpath. Residents of the development would be likely to make use of the services and facilities provided in these settlements. As such, the site could be considered to be reasonably well related to them and would support their vitality and viability. There is also a bus stop providing regular access to larger settlements, including Bedford, located a short distance to the east. Whilst it is inevitable that car use would be required to access the full range of services, facilities and employment, in basic terms the scheme would meet the requirements of the Framework paragraph 78. It appears that the site is more conveniently located in relation to services and facilities than the Wilden case referred to by the Council.
45. There is no specific demonstration that the proposal would meet local need or that it has community support. Nonetheless, as indicated, there is nothing to suggest that Policy 7S requires that all 13 criteria must be met for development in the countryside to be acceptable. To suggest otherwise would be overly restrictive.
46. I therefore conclude that the countryside location of the site would be suitable for a development of this nature. In this regard the requirements of Policy 7S, Policy 65 and the Framework paragraph 78 would be met. The Council's reason for refusal also refers to the Framework paragraph 91 in relation to promoting healthy, inclusive and safe communities, and paragraphs 102/103 regarding sustainable transport. Whilst in basic terms the location of the appeal development supports the underlying principles of these provisions, their application is of greater relevance to larger scale developments.

Other Matters

47. Interested party representations refer to noise and dust from farm vehicles and the grain dryer directly to the north. The granary and its eastern extension would be most closely related to this building. The plans illustrate the limited number of openings on the northern elevation of this building, with the main living area located in the new build area, which would benefit from sound insulation. The garden would be located to the east and south of the building. As such any direct disturbance would be restricted. Further, I understand that the grain dryer is used for a limited period around harvest time, again minimising any perceived nuisance.
48. Reference is also made to the covenant which protects the farm. However, such private legal matters are not material to planning decisions.

Conditions

49. I have considered the suggested conditions in the light of the advice set out in the Government's PPG. I have made minor amendments to avoid duplication.
50. Conditions requiring development and works to be carried out in accordance with approved plans provides certainty. Conditions relating to a building recording strategy are necessary to ensure the proper recording of designated heritage assets. Those relating to an archaeological mitigation strategy are required to safeguard and record archaeological assets. Details of both the external building materials to be used and the proposed internal insulation are necessary to protect the significance of the listed buildings. Detailed drawings

relating to replacement windows and doors are required for the same reason. Also, details of the proposed boundary treatments, hard and soft landscaping and bin/bicycle storage are required to protect the settings of the listed buildings.

51. Both a biodiversity enhancement strategy and a lighting design strategy for biodiversity are necessary to protect habitats and species. A condition requiring an energy audit is required to support sustainable development principles. Details of electric charging points are required for similar reasons. Details of bicycle and car parking facilities are required to ensure that safe and secure provision is made. Adequate bin storage and suitable collection points are required to protect the amenity of residents. The demonstration of water efficiency standards is necessary to minimise water use in the interests of environmental management. Finally, the provision of reliable broadband is necessary to enable opportunities for web-based communication and home working.
52. I consider the pre-commencement conditions to be so fundamental to the development that it would have otherwise been necessary to refuse permissions.

Conclusion: both Appeals

53. The less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets would be overcome by public benefits. In locational terms the scheme would be acceptable, and there are no outstanding concerns relating to highway safety or biodiversity matters. The proposal would accord with statute and the development plan, and there are no material considerations to outweigh these findings. I therefore conclude that both appeals should succeed.

A J Mageean

INSPECTOR

Appendix 1: Schedule of Conditions

Appeal A: Ref APP/K0235/W/20/3255478

1. The development hereby permitted shall not begin later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - Site Location Plan, drawing no. 000 rev P2;
 - Existing Site Plan, drawing no. 1928_100 rev P2;
 - Existing Plans – Barn, drawing no. 1928_101 rev P2;
 - Existing Elevations – Barn, drawing no. 1928_102 rev P2;
 - Existing Elevations – Barn, drawing no. 1928_103 rev P2;
 - Existing Elevations – Barn, drawing no. 1928_104 rev P2;
 - Existing Sections – Barn, drawing no. 1928_105 rev P2;
 - Existing Plans – Stables and Piggery, drawing no. 1928_106 rev P2;
 - Existing Elevations – Stables and Piggery, drawing no. 1928_107 rev P2;
 - Existing Elevations – Stables and Piggery, drawing no. 1928_108 rev P2;
 - Existing Elevation – Stables and Piggery, drawing no. 1928_109 rev P2;
 - Existing Sections – Stables and Piggery, drawing no. 1928_110 rev P2;
 - Proposed Site Plan Overview, drawing no. 1928_200 rev P5;
 - Proposed Site Plan, drawing no. 1928_201 rev P5;
 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan Plot 2, drawing no. 1928_300 rev P4;
 - Proposed First Floor Plan Plot 2, drawing no. 1928_301 rev P4;
 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan Plots 3&4, drawing no. 1928_302 rev P5;
 - Proposed First Floor Plan, drawing no. 1928_303 rev P5;
 - Proposed Elevations Plot 2, drawing no. 1928_400 rev P4;
 - Proposed Elevations Plot 2, drawing no. 1928_401 rev P3;
 - Proposed Elevations Plot 2, drawing no. 1928_402 rev P4;
 - Proposed Elevations Plots 3&4, drawing no. 1928_403 rev P3;
 - Proposed Elevations Plots 3&4, drawing no. 1928_404 rev P3;
 - Proposed Elevations Plots 3&4, drawing no. 1928_405 rev P5;
 - Proposed Section (1) Plot 2, drawing no. 1928_500 rev P5;
 - Proposed Section (2) Plot 2, drawing no. 1928_501 rev P5;
 - Proposed Section (3) Plot 3, drawing no. 1928_502 rev P5; and Proposed Section (4) Plot 4, drawing no. 1928_503 rev P5.
3. No development shall take place until building recording strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall include a timetable and the following components (the completion of each to the satisfaction of the local planning authority will result in a separate confirmation of compliance for each component):
 - a. building recording fieldwork;
 - b. a post recording assessment report (to be submitted within six months of the completion of recording);
 - c. the preparation of site archive ready for deposition at a store approved by the local planning authority, completion of an archive report, and submission of a publication report (to be completed within two years of the completion of recording). The recording strategy shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timings.

4. No development shall take place until an archaeological mitigation strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The archaeological mitigation strategy shall include a timetable and the following components (the completion of each to the satisfaction of the local planning authority will result in a separate confirmation of compliance for each component).
 - a. fieldwork and/or preservation 'in situ' of archaeological remains;
 - b. a post excavation assessment group report (to be submitted within six months of the completion of fieldwork);
 - c. a post excavation analysis report, preparation of site archive ready for deposition at a store approved by the local planning authority, completion of an archived report, and submission of a publication report (to be completed within two years of the completion of fieldwork). The archaeological mitigation strategy shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timings.
5. Prior to the commencement of development, full details of the external materials to be used in the works (to include the sample of new roof materials, tiled cladding to Plot 2, aluminium coping to Plot 3, sample panel of new masonry and new guttering and rainwater goods) shall be made available on site for inspection and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
6. Notwithstanding the details submitted and prior to the commencement of any development, full details of all new and replacement windows and doors (to include roof lights and details of the glazed link) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such drawings shall include sections showing the position of the windows/ doors in relation to the face of the wall, depth of reveal together with arch and sill details. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
7. Notwithstanding the details submitted, prior to the commencement of any works to the listed buildings, full details of the boundary enclosures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
8. Notwithstanding the details submitted and prior to the commencement of any works to the listed buildings, full details of the proposed hard and soft landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
9. Notwithstanding the details submitted and prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted, full details of the proposed bin storage and bicycle storage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
10. No development shall take place until a biodiversity enhancement scheme (to include details of protection and management of habitats and species and incorporating opportunities for the enhancement of existing and the creation of new habitats on site) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the

local planning authority. The scheme shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

11.No development shall take place until an energy audit (including timetable) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The energy audit shall demonstrate how the development will achieve a 10% improvement in the Dwelling Emission Rate over the Target Emission Rate as defined in The Building Regulations Approved Document L1A: Conservation of Fuel and Power in New Dwellings (2013) and shall include:

- An assessment of the predicted carbon dioxide emissions of the development once occupied;
- A review of alternative methods for reducing the predicted carbon emissions of the development once occupied and their anticipated effectiveness;
- Proposals for measuring the effectiveness of the chosen methods for reducing the predicted carbon dioxide emissions of the development once occupied;
- Consideration of how the layout orientation design and materials used in the development can affect the consumption and use of energy.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved energy audit.

12.The new dwellings hereby approved shall not be occupied until a scheme for car and bicycle parking (with access thereto) for both the new dwellings and the existing farmhouse in accordance with Bedford Borough Council's Parking Standards for Sustainable Communities: Design and Good Practice 2014 have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented and made available for use before the development is occupied and the car and bicycle parking areas shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose.

13.The new dwellings hereby approved shall not be occupied until full details of the bin storage/collection point(s) in accordance with the adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Climate Change and Pollution 2008' have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The storage and collection bins shall be provided in accordance with the approved scheme and thereafter retained.

14.The new dwellings hereby approved shall not be occupied until a 'lighting design strategy for biodiversity' for the residential development and access areas has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall a) identify those areas/features on site to which bats are particularly sensitive and that are likely to cause disturbance in or around their breeding sites and resting places, or along important routes used to reach key areas of their territory, for example, for foraging, and b) show how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that the areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places. All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the strategy, and these shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the strategy. Under no circumstances should any other external lighting be installed without prior consent from the local planning authority.

15. No building shall be occupied until a scheme of electric car charging points has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out and operated in accordance with the approved scheme.
16. The new dwellings shall achieve and maintain the higher water efficiency standard in the Building Regulations are set out in Approved Document G: Sanitation, hot water safety and water efficiency, 2015 edition, DCLG October 2015 (or similar replacement standard).
17. The new dwellings shall be served with an appropriate open access fibre optic infrastructure to enable high speed and reliable broadband connection unless evidence is submitted which demonstrates that providing the required infrastructure is not feasible or economically viable.

Appeal B: Ref APP/K0235/Y/20/3255480

1. The works hereby permitted shall not begin later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
2. The works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - Site Location Plan, drawing no. 000 rev P2;
 - Existing Site Plan, drawing no. 1928_100 rev P2;
 - Existing Plans – Barn, drawing no. 1928_101 rev P2;
 - Existing Elevations – Barn, drawing no. 1928_102 rev P2;
 - Existing Elevations – Barn, drawing no. 1928_103 rev P2;
 - Existing Elevations – Barn, drawing no. 1928_104 rev P2;
 - Existing Sections – Barn, drawing no. 1928_105 rev P2;
 - Existing Plans – Stables and Piggery, drawing no. 1928_106 rev P2;
 - Existing Elevations – Stables and Piggery, drawing no. 1928_107 rev P2;
 - Existing Elevations – Stables and Piggery, drawing no. 1928_108 rev P2;
 - Existing Elevation – Stables and Piggery, drawing no. 1928_109 rev P2;
 - Existing Sections – Stables and Piggery, drawing no. 1928_110 rev P2;
 - Proposed Site Plan Overview, drawing no. 1928_200 rev P5;
 - Proposed Site Plan, drawing no. 1928_201 rev P5;
 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan Plot 2, drawing no. 1928_300 rev P4;
 - Proposed First Floor Plan Plot 2, drawing no. 1928_301 rev P4;
 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan Plots 3&4, drawing no. 1928_302 rev P5;
 - Proposed First Floor Plan, drawing no. 1928_303 rev P5;
 - Proposed Elevations Plot 2, drawing no. 1928_400 rev P4;
 - Proposed Elevations Plot 2, drawing no. 1928_401 rev P3;
 - Proposed Elevations Plot 2, drawing no. 1928_402 rev P4;
 - Proposed Elevations Plots 3&4, drawing no. 1928_403 rev P3;
 - Proposed Elevations Plots 3&4, drawing no. 1928_404 rev P3;
 - Proposed Elevations Plots 3&4, drawing no. 1928_405 rev P5;
 - Proposed Section (1) Plot 2, drawing no. 1928_500 rev P5;
 - Proposed Section (2) Plot 2, drawing no. 1928_501 rev P5;
 - Proposed Section (3) Plot 3, drawing no. 1928_502 rev P5; and Proposed Section (4) Plot 4, drawing no. 1928_503 rev P5.
3. No works shall take place until building recording strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall

include a timetable and the following components (the completion of each to the satisfaction of the local planning authority will result in a separate confirmation of compliance for each component):

- a. building recording fieldwork;
 - b. a post recording assessment report (to be submitted within six months of the completion of recording);
 - c. the preparation of site archive ready for deposition at a store approved by the local planning Authority, completion of an archive report, and submission of a publication report (to be completed within two years of the completion of recording). The recording strategy shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timings.
4. No works shall take place until an archaeological mitigation strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The archaeological mitigation strategy shall include a timetable and the following components (the completion of each to the satisfaction of the local planning authority will result in a separate confirmation of compliance for each component):
 - a. fieldwork and/or preservation 'in situ' of archaeological remains;
 - b. a post excavation assessment group report (to be submitted within six months of the completion of fieldwork);
 - c. a post excavation analysis report, preparation of site archive ready for deposition at a store approved by the local planning authority, completion of an archived report, and submission of a publication report (to be completed within two years of the completion of fieldwork). The archaeological mitigation strategy shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timings.
5. Prior to the commencement of any works, full details of the external materials to be used in the works (to include the sample of new roof materials, tiled cladding to Plot 2, aluminium coping to Plot 3, sample panel of new masonry and new guttering and rainwater goods) shall be made available on site for inspection and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
6. Prior to the commencement of any works, full details of the proposed internal insulation for Plots 2 and 4 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
7. Notwithstanding the details submitted and prior to the commencement of any works, full details of all new and replacement windows and doors (to include roof lights and details of the glazed link) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such drawings shall include sections showing the position of the windows/ doors in relation to the face of the wall, depth of reveal together with arch and sill details. The works shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.