

# Report of Consultation

## Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance

## Re-use and Adaptation of Rural Buildings

### 1 Introduction

- 1.1 This report sets out the consultation that was undertaken on the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance Re-use and Adaptation of Rural Buildings, including a summary of the responses received and how they have been taken into account by the Council.
- 1.2 The Council consulted the general public on the proposed SPG for a period of 8 weeks between 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2014 and 28<sup>th</sup> April 2014. The consultation included public notices in local papers, press releases, and a letter to all people on the Local Development Plan database, including (but not limited to): City, Town and Community Councils; Councillors; Assembly Members; Members of Parliament; adjacent local authorities, stakeholders and the general public informing them of the consultation and telling them how to respond. Copies of the document were made available on the Denbighshire website, in public libraries and Council One Stop Shops.

### 2 Responses received

- 2.1 7 individuals and organisations responded to the consultation, including Bodfari Community Council, AONB JAC, Anwyl Construction, CPAT and CPRW. Late responses were received from Natural Resources Wales and Cllr Martyn Holland which have also been included in the report. Responses to the public consultation raised the following issues:
- General support from many for 12 month marketing period, one felt it should be longer, one shorter.
  - Extra reference should be made to sensitive landscape and archaeological areas.
  - Concerns over viability of converting for any uses other than market housing.
  - Agreement that extensions should be subordinate to original buildings.
- 2.2 Detailed consultation responses are included at the end of this report in table A.

**Table A – Consultation responses**

| Representor               | Comments (summary)  | Council's Response   | Changes proposed  |
|---------------------------|---|--|---|
| Bodfari Community Council | <p>Guidance should make reference to use of suitable materials, insulation and energy efficiency.</p> <p>Town/Community Councils should be included in the list of local interest groups.</p>   | <p><b>Agreed</b>, para 8.2 will be amended to include references.</p> <p><b>Agreed</b>, para 6.3 will be amended.</p>  | <p>Amendments to paragraph 8.2 to refer to the use of suitable materials, insulation and energy efficiency.</p> <p>Amendments to paragraph 6.3 to refer to City/Town /Community Councils.</p>   |
| AONB JAC                  | <p>Support broad thrust of policy and guidance that gives priority of seeking economic use for rural Buildings. Also concerned at loss of local shops and services.</p> <p>Para 3.1 and section 8 should make specific reference to AONB and World Heritage Site and need for extra sensitivity in these areas.</p> <p>Support proposed 12 month marketing period prior to considering other uses.</p> <p>Support principle of securing affordable housing for local people in rural areas but have concerns about viability. Suggest policy is monitored regarding delivery.</p> | <p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Reference to be made in amended Section 8.</p> <p>Comments Noted.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that in some cases conversion of rural buildings to affordable housing would not be financially viable, due to the higher costs of conversion compared to new build and provided that this can be demonstrated to be unviable conversion for market housing may be acceptable. It is proposed to amend</p> | <p>Amendments to Section 8 to refer to the AONB &amp; World Heritage Site</p> <p>Amendments to Section 7 to clarify that provided that conversion to affordable housing can be demonstrated to be unviable conversion for market housing may be acceptable.</p> |

| Representor        | Comments (summary)   | Council's Response  | Changes proposed  |
|--------------------|--|---|---|
|                    | <p>Para 8.5a support that buildings should be capable of conversion without need for extension. Where extension considered should be subservient to original building.</p> <p>Concerned about deletion of requirement for building to be redundant. SPG should state that conversion of building should not give rise to need for replacement building unless fully justified.</p> <p>Para 8.6 should cross reference to SPG on residential space standards.</p> <p>Where rights of way are affected need to maintain integrity and continuity of the network should be a requirement.</p> | <p>the SPG to reflect this.</p> <p>Agreed, para 8.5a to be amended accordingly.</p> <p>A requirement for redundancy would run contrary to National policy guidance see TAN 6 Rural Economy 3.2.1. Para 3.3.2 goes on to suggest conditions relating to new agricultural buildings where former ones are converted.</p> <p>Cross references to Residential Space Standards occur throughout the document, additional mention in 8.6 not considered necessary.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> | <p>Amendment to paragraph 8.5 (a) to clarify that any agreed extensions must be modest in scale and subordinate to the original building.</p> <p>No change proposed</p> <p>No change proposed</p> <p>No change proposed</p> |
| Anwyl Construction | Express concern regarding policy PSE 4 and the viability of converting for employment or affordable housing uses. Concerns over vacancy and dereliction of rural buildings as a result.  | The Council acknowledges that in some cases conversion of rural buildings to affordable housing would not be financially viable, due to the higher costs of conversion compared to new build and provided that this can be demonstrated to be unviable  | Amendments to Section 7 to clarify that provided that conversion to affordable housing can be demonstrated to be unviable, conversion for market housing may be acceptable.   |

| Representor   | Comments (summary)   | Council's Response   | Changes proposed  |
|---|--|--|---|
|   | Policy PSE 4 should be revised and SPG withdrawn until this happens.   | conversion for market housing may be acceptable. It is proposed to amend the SPG to reflect this.<br>LDP policies will be revised as part of the LDP review as necessary.  |   |
| Clwyd-Powys Archaeological Trust                          | Prospective developers should be encouraged to contact CPAT and County Archaeologist prior to submitting development proposals for older buildings.  | Agreed para 8.8 should be amended to reflect this request.   | Amendments to paragraph 8.8 to add: Where there may be archaeological interest on site, applicants are encouraged to make early contact with the County Archaeologist and/or CPAT.                |
| Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Clwyd Branch) | <p>Para 6.8 – agree that 12 months is an appropriate period for marketing but feel that this may need to be extended depending on economic situation prevailing at the time.</p> <p>Para 8.5 – instead of prescribed percentage for extensions, should state that they be ancillary to original building.</p> <p>Suggest including additional paragraph that where appropriate, a photographic record of original building be submitted to and approved by LPA prior to development taking place. This record to be deposited with County Sites and Monuments Record operated by CPAT.</p> | <p>Comment noted, a marketing period in excess of 12 months may be considered overly onerous.</p> <p>Agreed para 8.5a to be amended accordingly.</p> <p>This would be conditioned in relation to any appropriate planning consent.</p> | <p>No change proposed</p> <p>Amendment to paragraph 8.5 (a) to clarify that any agreed extensions must be modest in scale and subservient to the original building.</p> <p>No change proposed</p> |

| Representor       | Comments (summary)   | Council's Response  | Changes proposed   |
|-------------------|--|---|--|
| Cunliffe Planning | <p>Para 5.1 – should emphasise that list suggested is not exhaustive. Suggest adding petrol filling stations; farm shops; bakeries and industrial premises.</p> <p>Para 5.2 – a large number of rural buildings are in unsustainable locations which may exclude many from consideration.</p> <p>Para 5.3 – requirements too prescriptive particularly % in last bullet point.</p> <p>Para 6.2 – requirements for marketing are too onerous, 'Other organisations' should be defined.</p> <p>Para 6.3 – 12 months considered too long, in 12 months a vacant building could fall into disrepair. Useful for the Council to specify a regional newspaper to be used. Marketing requirements unreasonable, rural location of many properties would make them unsuitable for employment, commercial or community uses. Not having to advertise a rural building for commercial purposes will aid recovery of economy.</p> | <p>The list is intended to be illustrative and not exhaustive. A statement to that effect is already included at the end of the list.</p> <p>Sustainable development is at the heart of the LDP and some buildings may be in such remote locations that they should not be considered for re-use.</p> <p>It is proposed to remove the final bullet point from paragraph 5.3, and delete paragraph 8.4 in order to provide greater flexibility. Marketing requirements are considered reasonable and achievable. The 'other' organisations are likely to vary depending on location of the development proposal and this has been left flexible.</p> <p>12 months has received support through the consultation process and has been benchmarked against other north Wales LPAs. Marketing can take place prior or concurrent to a building ceasing its current use and therefore dereliction should not arise. The County is a large one and different areas are covered by different papers depending on where</p> | <p>No change proposed</p> <p>No change proposed</p> <p>Amendment to paragraph 5.3 to remove the final bullet point &amp; deletion of paragraph 8.4</p> <p>No change proposed</p> |

| Representor             | Comments (summary)  | Council's Response  | Changes proposed  |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|
|                         | <p>Para 8.5 - % limit not appropriate, each case should be considered on its merits.</p> <p>SPG should contain pictures of successful conversions.</p> <p>Draft SPG does not help with the Council's drive to be open for business and to improve the rural economy. Viability of converting rural buildings doubtful, Denbighshire will have a legacy of dereliction. Policy PSE 4 is flawed as it is unlikely that it will be viable to convert for affordable housing.</p> | <p>the development proposal is and this has been left flexible.<br/>Agreed, para 8.5a to be amended.</p> <p>Agreed final version will have appropriate illustrations.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that in some cases conversion of rural buildings to affordable housing would not be financially viable, due to the higher costs of conversion compared to new build and provided that this can be demonstrated to be unviable conversion for market housing may be acceptable. It is proposed to amend the SPG to reflect this.<br/>LDP policies will be monitored annually and revised as part of the LDP review as necessary.</p> | <p>Amendment to paragraph 8.5 (a) to clarify that any agreed extensions must be modest in scale and subordinate to the original building.<br/>Appropriate illustrations will be included in the final version.<br/>Amendments to Section 7 to clarify that provided that conversion to affordable housing can be demonstrated to be unviable conversion for market housing may be acceptable.</p> |
| Natural Resources Wales | <p>Advise that exterior design and appearance reflect local vernacular and designs.</p> <p>Include a paragraph highlighting AONB and WHS.</p> <p>Welcome para on wildlife.</p>  | <p>Comments noted. Section 7 requires the retention of existing features and materials wherever possible.<br/>Reference to be made in amended para 8.8.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>  | <p>No change proposed</p> <p>Amendments to Section 8 to refer to the AONB &amp; World Heritage Site<br/>No change proposed</p>  |

| Representor         | Comments (summary)  | Council's Response   | Changes proposed  |
|---------------------|---|--|---|
|                     | <p>Suggest mentioning derogation purposes in section under bats.</p> <p>Include requirements for appropriate 'bat' friendly building design specifications.</p> <p>Proposals that have implications for nursery roosts are likely to require post project surveillance and monitoring.</p> <p>Consider mentioning there may be need to dedicate all or part of a structure specifically for use as bat roosts.</p> <p>Duties in respect of birds and biodiversity should be assessed and addressed to the satisfaction of the Council's ecological officer and third party specialists.</p> | <p>Reference is made in paragraph 8.7 to the appropriate legislation, SPG specifically on biodiversity to be produced and not necessary to duplicate here. Detailed conditions would be attached to any planning permission.</p> <p>Detailed conditions would be attached to any planning permission.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.7 to be amended accordingly.</p>  | <p>No change proposed</p> <p>No change proposed</p> <p>Amendments to paragraph 8.7 to refer to duties in respect of birds and biodiversity.</p>                                   |
| Cllr Martyn Holland | <p>1) Barns by their nature are often remote and most first time buyers are looking for housing in villages or towns for convenience, schools, public transport, etc.</p> <p>2) Barns cost a considerable amount of money to convert due to the fact that the fabric of the buildings is often in a poor state of repair and some can even be listed. Many barns are remote and utilities are often not on site. If a well is required to supply water these can cost a minimum of £10k to create. Because of these costs they can hardly be called affordable.</p>                         | <p>The Council acknowledges that in some cases conversion of rural buildings to affordable housing would not be financially viable, due to the higher costs of conversion compared to new build and provided that this can be demonstrated to be unviable conversion for market housing may be acceptable. It is proposed to amend the SPG to reflect this.</p> <p>LDP policies will be monitored annually and revised as part of the LDP review as necessary.</p> | <p>Amendments to Section 7 to clarify that provided that conversion to affordable housing can be demonstrated to be unviable conversion for market housing may be acceptable.</p> |

| Representor | Comments (summary)  | Council's Response   | Changes proposed  |
|-------------|---|--|---|
|             | <p>I totally agree with the proposed policy that closed village pubs and shops must be actively advertised as pubs and shops for a minimum of twelve months before we should consider any planning application for change of use for residential purposes. I firmly believe that they should be advertised UK wide using all types of media options.</p> <p>I do not agree with the view that they should only be advertised in Wales as I feel that it is important that these community facilities stay open not matter who runs them. This is the only way we will stop the depopulation of rural areas and in the long term protect the Welsh language. We already know from statistics that younger people are leaving Wales for better job opportunities elsewhere in the world and the loss of village amenities will only accelerate this exodus.</p> | <p>Paragraph 6.3 sets out the marketing requirements for rural buildings and it is proposed to include a requirement for web-based marketing by a commercial property agent. This would include national coverage.</p> | <p>Amend paragraph 6.3 to include reference to web-based marketing.</p> |