

## SCHEDULE A: Applications with Recommendation

13/0683

Item No: 19

Date of Committee: 15/11/2013

**Appn Ref No:**  
13/0683

**Applicant:**  
Mr & Mrs Stockdale

**Parish:**  
Burtholme

**Date of Receipt:**  
29/08/2013 16:00:06

**Agent:**  
Green Design Architects

**Ward:**  
Irthing

**Location:**

Units 2 (Roman Retreat) & 3, Former Kingwater  
Equestrian Centre, Walton, Brampton, CA8 2JW

**Proposal:** Removal Of Condition 12 Of Previously Approved Permission 02/0342  
To Allow Units 2 And 3 To Be Used As Permanent Residential  
Accommodation

---

### REPORT

**Case Officer:** Richard Maunsell

#### 1. Recommendation

1.1 It is recommended that this application is approved with conditions.

#### 2. Main Issues

2.1 Whether The Removal Of The Condition Restricting The Of Occupancy Of  
The Holiday Unit Is Acceptable

2.2 Effect On Living Conditions Of The Occupiers Of Neighbouring Properties

2.3 Other Matters

#### 3. Application Details

##### Introduction

3.1 The application seeks Full Planning permission for the removal of a planning  
condition that currently restricts the length of occupation of a holiday unit at  
Roman Retreat, Burtholme, Walton.

3.2 The building forms part of the former Kingwater Equestrian Centre which is  
situated on the southern side of the road leading from Walton to Lanercost.

The Centre comprises of a large indoor riding arena, stables and tack rooms. Adjacent to the eastern boundary is a linear row of single storey buildings, part of which is a dwelling, part is a holiday unit and the remainder is unconverted.

- 3.3 The single storey holiday units are set within a courtyard. To the north and east of the application site is a working farm, to the south is a dwelling and to the west are range of equestrian buildings and land within the applicant's ownership.

## **Background**

- 3.4 Planning permission was granted in 2002 for the conversion of outbuildings to form three dwellings. The consent was subject to condition 12 which states:

“This permission relates to:

- a) the conversion of “unit 1”, as identified on drawing number 01/1222/04/REV A, as a single dwelling; and
- b) the use of “units 2 and 3”, as identified on drawing number 01/1222/04/REV A, solely for short term holiday units which shall not be let for more than 21 days to any individual or party at anytime. The aforementioned “units 2 and 3” shall not be subsequently sold, let or otherwise be allowed to be occupied as permanent accommodation.”

- 3.5 Since that time, one of the buildings has been converted to a dwelling and another to a holiday unit. The remaining building, which also has consent for holiday use, is unconverted. Due to a change in the applicant's financial circumstances, the adjacent equestrian centre was advertised for sale and has since been recovered by the financial lender.

## **Proposal**

- 3.6 The application seeks consent to remove condition 12 of the planning permission to allow the occupation of both the converted and unconverted holiday units to be occupied as unfettered dwelling houses.

## **4. Summary of Representations**

- 4.1 This application has been advertised by means of a site notice and direct notification to the occupiers of 2 of the neighbouring properties. In response, 4 letters of objection have been received and the main issues raised are summarised as follows:

1. the applicants have lived in the property for 2 years without planning permission;
2. there is no private access to the properties;
3. electricity and water services are connected through the former Kingwater Equestrian centre;

4. the public foot path passes through the small yards of the properties where walkers are made to feel uncomfortable by the residents, their dogs and the dog mess which will only be made worse if they are permanent dwellings;
5. the tiles of the buildings don't match those of the neighbouring buildings;
6. there are complaints from the applicants about the noise from the neighbouring working farm which will continue if permission is granted;
7. when planning permission was granted for the equestrian buildings, passing places were supposed to be formed which was never undertaken;
8. the holiday lets should be retained given that they are in an area close to Hadrian's Wall and they should be retained for tourism to boost the local economy;
9. a fence has been erected around the properties which obstructs the public footpath;
10. the gates to the site are locked meaning that visitors park in the curtilage of neighbouring properties.

## 5. Summary of Consultation Responses

Cumbria County Council - (Highway Authority - Footpaths): - no objection; however, a site layout plan should be submitted which defines the 2 units and associated (shared) access and parking space;

Ramblers Association: - comments awaited;

Cumbria County Council - (Econ. Dir. Highways & Transportation): - comments awaited;

Burtholme Parish Council: - no comment.

## 6. Officer's Report

### Assessment

- 6.1 The relevant planning policies against which the application is required to be assessed are the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) together with Policies DP1, H1, CP6, and LC8 of the Carlisle District Local Plan 2001-2016. The proposal raises the following issues.

#### 1. Whether The Removal Of The Condition Restricting The Of Occupancy Of The Holiday Unit Is Acceptable

- 6.2 The objectives of national planning policy are reflected in Policy DP1 of the Carlisle District Local Plan. They require that the overall quality of life within Cumbria should be enhanced through the promotion of sustainable development that seeks to protect the environment, ensure prudent use of resources and maintains social progress and economic growth.
- 6.3 Since adoption of the Local Plan, the NPPF has been published by the Government and is a material consideration in the determination of this

application. Policy considerations in relation to this application state that whilst development should be considered against Local Plan policies, the Council's Local Plan (in respect of the issue of housing) cannot be considered up to date under the NPPF. The Framework seeks to promote sustainable development and in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the viability of rural communities.

6.4 With regard to the conversion of existing buildings, the NPPF is permissive of such proposals where "the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting".

6.5 The issue for Members to consider here is the weight that should be attached to the word "redundant" in the NPPF. The Oxford English Dictionary describes the meaning of the adjective as:

"not or no longer needed or useful; superfluous"

6.6 The applicant has provided supporting information details that the holiday cottage was last used for such a purpose in September 2010 and since then, he has been unable to secure any bookings due to the demise of the equestrian centre. The cottage remained empty until October 2011 when the applicant moved in. The statement continues by stating that the buildings were valued in 2011 and 2012 as holiday units and were marketed as such in 2012. Following a series of price reductions, the buildings were removed from the market in July 2013, some 18 months later, due to the lack of interest.

6.7 The NPPF requires that the conversion of redundant buildings must "lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting". Although the buildings are not visually prominent from the County highway, there is a public footpath that crosses the site. Whilst it is recognised that there is some issue with regard to the relationship of the footpath with the garden area created to the front of the buildings, these gardens have the benefit of planning permission following the original consent granted in 2002.

6.8 The unconverted barn would undoubtedly lead to an enhancement of the setting given its current condition and appearance. Whilst the other building has been converted and the argument less transparent, refusal of this application would mean that the building would have to be vacated and used as a holiday use. If no vacancy for such were secured, as advised by the applicant in his supporting statement, this building would fall into a state of disrepair and neglect; therefore, removal of the condition would ensure that the building continues to enhance the character and appearance of the area. The principle of the removal of the condition is therefore acceptable.

## **2. Effect On Living Conditions Of The Occupiers Of Neighbouring Properties**

6.9 There are residential properties in the vicinity of the application site, namely Burthingurst House which is approximately 11 metres to the south and Pine Grove which is approximately 67 metres to the east. The principle of using

the barns has already been established. At present, the buildings could be occupied for holiday purposes all year round. The removal of the condition would not result an intensification of the use of the site or change the overall use of the site. The living conditions of the occupiers of the nearby properties would not suffer from loss of privacy or unacceptable levels of noise or disturbance.

- 6.10 The letters of objection raise issues about the relationship between the buildings and the adjacent farm and complaints raised by both parties with regard to noise. These complaints have been investigated by the Council's Environmental Health Officers. The permanent occupation of these buildings would not exacerbate this issue as it is specific to the individuals involved.

### **3. Other Matters**

- 6.11 The Highway Authority has advised that a plan showing the allocated parking from the properties should be submitted by the applicant. The approved drawings for the conversion of the buildings, show 6 parking spaces within the courtyard for the 3 buildings. As the application is for a variation of the occupancy condition, all other matters including the layout of the site are unaffected.
- 6.12 Some objectors have made reference to the access arrangements. The applicant currently controls the access to the site and would be able to retain access through the legal documents associated with the site.
- 6.13 In addition, the objectors raise the issue of the public footpath and that access across it is now prohibited. The Footpaths Officer at Cumbria County Council is aware of this issue. The gardens formed part of the planning permission granted in 2002 do appear to have been built over the line of the footpath; however, the applicant has provided gated access at either end. If it subsequently transpires that additional signage or a footpath diversion is required, this would be a separate matter for between the applicant and the County Council outwith the consideration of this application.
- 6.14 The proposal has been considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Article 8 and Article 1 Protocol 1 are relevant but the impact of the development in these respects will be minimal and the separate rights of the individuals under this legislation will not be prejudiced. If it was to be alleged that there was conflict it is considered not to be significant enough to warrant the refusal of permission.

### **Conclusion**

- 6.15 In overall terms, the site is not in a sustainable location; however, the policies within the NPPF are supportive of the use of the buildings as permanent residential dwellings. The living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties would not be adversely affected by the extended occupancy period. In all aspects the proposal is considered to be compliant with the objectives of the relevant Local Plan policies.

## **7. Planning History**

- 7.1 Planning permission was granted in 2002 for the conversion of outbuildings into 3 dwellings.
- 7.2 An application for the removal of condition 12 (restriction of length of letting period) of the previously approved planning application 02/0342 was submitted in 2011 but was withdrawn prior to determination.
- 7.3 Later in 2011, consent was granted for the variation of condition 12 (restriction of length of letting period) of the previously approved planning application 02/0342 to increase from 21 day let to up to 56 day let.

## **8. Recommendation: Grant Permission**

1. The approved documents for this Planning Permission comprise:
  1. the Planning Application Form received 2nd September 2013;
  2. the Location Plan received 2nd September 2013 (Drawing no. 13/2186/01);
  3. the Notice of Decision;
  4. any such variation as may subsequently be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To define the permission.

2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the remaining conditions attached to the "Full Planning" permission approved under application 02/0342.

**Reason:** For the avoidance of doubt.

---



RECEIVED  
02 SEP 2013  
2013/0693

GREEN DESIGN ARCHITECTS  
 10000 Greenway Road, Suite 100, Irvine, CA 92618  
 (949) 453-8800  
 www.greendesignarchitects.com

Location Plan  
 Ramon Riquelme, AIA  
 for Mr. & Mrs. Escobedo  
 80411 11000 Greenway Road, Suite 100  
 Irvine, CA 92618  
 (949) 453-8800

D	C	RV	DATE	DESCRIPTION

All information remains the property of the designer and may not be used for any purpose whatsoever, or reproduced through any medium without the written permission of the designer. No responsibility is accepted for unauthorized use. Do not scale off drawings, work from figured dimensions only and verify on site.