
Delegated report Officer: James Bate

Application ref. DMPA/2021/1422

Removal of exterior render and making good of brickwork and pointing at Sapperton Manor, Sapperton Lane, Church Broughton, Derby, DE65 5AU

Valid date: 15/09/2021

Consults expired: 29/10/2021

EIA development? No

Section 106 agreement? Not required

This decision is delegated to officers under the terms of the current Scheme of Delegation.

Relevant planning history

9/2002/0905/F - The extension and conversion into a dwelling (dependent relative unit) of a garage – Approved 21/JAN/2003

9/2002/0906/L - The extension and conversion into a dwelling (dependent relative unit) of a garage – Approved 21/JAN/2003

Responses to consultations and publicity

The Conservation Officer has acted as case officer in respect of this application so heritage matters are fully considered within the body of the report.

Church Broughton Parish Council - no objection

Relevant policy, guidance and/or legislation

The relevant Development Plan policies are:

2016 Local Plan Part 1 (LP1): Policy S2 (Presumption In Favour of Sustainable Development), Policy BNE2 (Heritage Assets)

2017 Local Plan Part 2 (LP2): BNE10 (Heritage)

The relevant local guidance is:

South Derbyshire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

The relevant national policy and guidance is:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

In addition the application is subject to the statutory duty described within section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990.

Planning considerations

Taking into account the application made, the documents submitted (and supplemented and/or amended where relevant) and the site and its environs; the main issue(s) central to the determination of this application is/are:

- The potential impact upon the property as a listed building

Planning assessment

Heritage Considerations

The application proposes works to return the former farmhouse at Sapperton Manor to an external facing brick finish.

The building had previously been rendered in a hard cement render, however this was removed from the building as a consequence of a fire at the property which left the render significantly damaged.

The owner of the property also owns the freehold of the adjacent former agricultural complex (also grade II listed and located immediately east of the former farmhouse) which has been converted to business units. As part of the conversion and renovation of these agricultural buildings, similar areas of render and reinforcement were removed (some of these were added to the buildings during the mid 20th century when the buildings were used as bulk grain stores) leaving damaged brickwork which then had to be repaired. This brickwork repair has been completed to a very high standard and upon consideration of the brickwork exposed on the former farmhouse following the fire, the owner wishes to explore the possibility of restoring the facing brick finish of the farmhouse.

Now that the modern render finish has been removed from the farmhouse, it is apparent based upon detailing of the building that it was intended to be an exposed brick building, with the application of render being itself a later alteration.

There is nothing objectionable about the principal of allowing an exposed brick finish to be reinstated, indeed it could be seen as removing an ill-advised previous phase of alteration and restoring the original finish. Doing so will take significant time and effort in repairs and repointing, however the owner and their contractor have demonstrated an ability and willingness to do so on the neighbouring farm buildings and there is little doubt that they have the expertise to do so successfully.

The only real risk of the proposal is that by exposing bricks which have become accustomed to being protected from weather, they may experience accelerated decay as their exposure is changed. Ultimately, should this occur to a particularly egregious degree then it may become necessary to reapply render to protect the brickwork. Given that the worst possible consequence of not rendering the building now and attempting to reinstate an exposed brick finish is that it may be necessary to render the building in the future, the situation is one where there is little to be lost by trying, other than the time and money of the property owner. They have been advised that this is the potential 'worst case' outcome and are still willing to attempt to reinstate a facing brick finish.

The work will involve turning some errored or damaged bricks, replacing some which are particularly badly decayed with new reclaimed brick and repointing the building.

Conclusion

The works proposed would reverse previous cementitious rendering of the building and as such have a justification which addresses the requirement of paragraph 200 of the NPPF. The proposals would achieve the 'desirable' objective described in section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 of 'preserving' the special architectural and historic significance of the property as a listed building.

As such, the proposal would also comply with the requirements of the NPPF within chapter 16 in regard to historic environment. The proposals also represent compliance with the objectives of policy BNE2 of the LP1 as well as policy BNE10 of the LP2.

As such, it is considered that listed building consent should be granted, subject to conditions.

Recommendation

Approve with Conditions

None of the other matters raised through the publicity and consultation process amount to material considerations outweighing the assessment of the main issues set out above, noting that conditions or obligations have been attached where meeting the tests for their imposition. Where relevant, regard has been had to the public sector equality duty, as required by section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 and to local finance considerations (as far as it is material), as required by section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), as well as climate change, human rights and other international legislation.

Recommendation made:	04/11/2021
Report agreed:	09/11/2021
Authorised officer:	Sarah Beeby
