

Delegated Report

Planning Ref: 25/01222/HOU

Applicant: Mr Ollie Wood

Ward: Cadeby Carlton M Bosworth & Shackerstone

Site: The Hayloft, 1 Boston Sidings Bull In The Oak Cadeby



Proposal: Erection of a garage

1. Recommendations

- 1.1. **Refuse planning permission** subject to the reasons at the end of this report.

2. Planning application description

- 2.1. The application seeks full planning consent for the erection of a garage at The Hayloft, 1 Boston Sidings, Bull In The Oak, Cadeby.
- 2.2. The proposed garage would be situated within the curtilage of the application site to the south-east of the host dwelling and to the west of the main access road. It would measure 7.00 metres in depth and 12.00 metres in width, comprising a dual-pitched roof form with an eaves height of 3.20 metres and a ridge height of 4.57 metres. The proposal would be constructed from metal with timber cladding to the walls, metal sheeting to the roof and metal to the openings which consists of two roller shutter doors to the front (western) elevation and a personal door to the side (northern) elevation.
- 2.3. The submitted Planning Statement states that the proposal would be *'partially for domestic storage purposes but also to allow for the storage of machinery and equipment in relation to the upkeep of a rear paddock.'*
- 2.4. Planning permission for the erection of garage of a similar scale at the application site was refused in 2025.

3. Description of the site and surrounding area

- 3.1. The application site relates to a two-storey detached dwelling situated to the north of Cadeby and to the east of Market Bosworth, outside of any identified settlement boundaries within the open countryside.
- 3.2. The application dwelling forms a group of dwellings known as 'Boston Sidings', a set of five dwellings all which have been designed to reflect the former agricultural use of the site (approved via planning permission 17/00149/FUL). All dwellings are of differing yet complementary architectural styles. Cadeby Homes who developed the site in 2019 and describes the site as a *'collection of five outstanding and unique properties [which] have been carefully designed to the highest quality reflecting the traditional craftsmanship whilst fusing together the feeling of luxury contemporary living'*.
- 3.3. The application dwelling itself, has a metal barrel vaulted roof and is finished predominantly in timber cladding, reflecting its two nearest neighbouring dwellings. It also has an integrated double garage (partially converted) and off/street driveway space which is designed to fit two vehicles and which forms part of the original building design. Along with the rear garden space and paddock land to the north of the dwelling, it also features a large garden (with an established protected tree and generous green space) to the property frontage which is perceived upon entry to the complex. The remaining dwellings on the gated estate (to the north and west of the application site) include two similarly designed traditional two-storey courtyard barn type dwellings and two dwellings resembling contemporary Dutch barn conversions.

The dwellings immediately to the south (outside of the complex) have significant heritage value (detailed further below) and are constructed using older red brick and tile, some of which are built as single storey barn conversions arranged around a courtyard along with the original two storey farmhouse that they historically served.

- 3.4. Permitted development rights relating to extensions and outbuildings were removed from the development under the 17/00149/FUL permission.
- 3.5. The application dwelling alongside the four other dwellings are all accessed via Bosworth Road, which is an adopted, classified, 'B' road that is subject to the National Speed Limit. Beyond these residential dwellings and the Bosworth Road is further open agricultural fields. There are also three trees, a Sycamore and two Common Ash trees which are protected under Tree Preservation Order, 23/00002/TPORD, adjacent to 1 Boston Sidings and Bosworth Road.
- 3.6. A Grade II listed late 18th Century farmhouse ('The Old Farmhouse', Bull in the Oak) is also located a relatively short distance to the east of the application site. The Farmhouse dates from the late 18th century and is a grade II listed building of special historic and architectural interest. Whilst its heritage significance is inherent in its built form, it does also draws some significance from its predominantly rural setting which includes surrounding agricultural fields and converted agricultural buildings formerly associated with its use and function. The application property is one of five modern dwellings constructed on part of the former farm complex. The dwellings have a combination of traditional and contemporary designs which positively reflect the former agricultural use of the site. As a result, the dwellings and the application site subject to this proposal are a positive presence within the setting of the listed building.

4. Relevant planning history

17/00149/FUL

- Removal of existing residential and agricultural buildings for the erection of 5 new dwellings and associated works
- Planning Permission
- 08.08.2018

23/00799/FUL

- Retrospective application for change of use of agriculture field to equestrian (sui generis) for private use, with the retention of a stable block and horse exercising area
- Planning Permission
- 20.05.2024

25/00660/HOU

- Proposed new garage
- Refused
- 03.10.2025

5. Publicity

- 5.1. The application has been publicised by sending out letters to local residents. A site notice was also posted within the vicinity of the site.
- 5.2. Following the publications no comments have been received.

6. Consultation

6.1. Cadeby Parish Council:

- No comments have been received.

6.2. HBBC Arboricultural Officer:

'I raise no arboricultural objection to the proposed garage/workshop, as no tree removals are required and the scheme can be delivered with appropriate safeguards.

If permission is granted, it should be subject to full compliance with the submitted Tree Protection Plan, including installation and retention of protective fencing/Construction Exclusion Zone prior to commencement, and use of the specified pad & beam foundation solution where works fall within the influence of T1.

For avoidance of doubt, all service runs/drainage must be routed outside the CEZ/RPAs, and any hard surfacing/landscaping within T1's RPA should be delivered using a clearly defined low-dig/no-dig specification within an Arboricultural Method Statement prior to commencing.'

6.3. HBBC Conservation Officer:

'The Bull in the Oak Farmhouse is located a relatively short distance to the east of the application site. The Farmhouse dates from the late 18th century and is a grade II listed building of special historic and architectural interest. Whilst its heritage significance is inherent in its built form, it does also draw some significance from its predominantly rural setting which includes surrounding agricultural fields and converted agricultural buildings formerly associated with its use and function. The application property is one of five modern dwellings constructed on part of the former farm complex. The dwellings have a combination of traditional and contemporary designs which positively reflect the former agricultural use of the site. As a result, the dwellings and the application site subject to this proposal are a positive presence within the setting of the listed building.

I agree with the concerns you have raised regarding the siting, scale, mass and unsympathetic industrial design of the garage, and as currently proposed it would be an uncharacteristic development that would not reflect the design quality of the associated modern dwellings nor respect the character of the wider area. Therefore, I agree with the current conflict with Policy DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (SADMP). In my opinion, for these same reasons the garage as currently proposed would also likely be a minor negative presence within the wider setting of the listed Farmhouse, causing an adverse impact (at the lower end of less than substantial harm) upon its heritage significance. In determining the application as decision-taker you shall have to undertake a harm vs public benefit balancing exercise as per paragraphs 212, 213 and 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024), Policies DM11 and DM12 of the SADMP, and determine whether the proposal meets the statutory duty of Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Should the balancing exercise not come out in favour of the proposal then this should form a reason for refusal of the application based on the conflict with Policies DM11 and DM12 of the SADMP, Section 16 of the NPPF and not meeting the statutory duty of Section 66 of the Act 1990.'

7. Policy

7.1. Core Strategy (2009)

- Policy 13: Rural Hamlets

7.2. Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016)

- Policy DM1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy DM4: Safeguarding the Countryside and Settlement Separation
- Policy DM6: Enhancement of Biodiversity and Ecological Interest
- Policy DM10: Development and Design
- Policy DM11: Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment
- Policy DM12: Heritage Assets
- Policy DM17: Highways and Transportation
- Policy DM18: Vehicle Parking Standards

7.3. National Planning Policies and Guidance

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
- National Design Guide (2019)
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (1990)

7.4. Other relevant guidance

- Hinckley and Bosworth Good Design Guide (2020)
- Leicestershire Highways Design Guide (2024)

8. Appraisal

8.1. Notwithstanding the countryside location outside of any settlement boundary, extensions and alterations to existing domestic properties are generally considered to be sustainable development in principle. The key issues in respect of this application are therefore:

- Design and impact upon the character of the area and the wider countryside
- Impact upon the significance and setting of the Grade II listed building ('The Old Farmhouse', Bull in the Oak)
- Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity
- Impact upon parking provision and highway safety
- Impact upon protected trees

Design and impact upon the character of the area

8.2. Chapter 12 of the NPPF confirms that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and the creation of high quality, beautiful, and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.

8.3. Key Policy Paragraph 135 of the NPPF details the six national policy requirements of development to ensure the creation of well-designed and beautiful places. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that development:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit.

- 8.4. Policy DM4 of the SADMP seeks to protect the safeguard the countryside and requires development to not have a significant adverse effect on the intrinsic value, beauty, open character and landscape character of the countryside and states extensions would only be permitted where they lead to an enhancement of the immediate setting. Policy DM4 of the SADMP allows for sustainable development in the countryside where it meets specific criteria. Criterion b) allows for development where it is for the extension of the existing buildings which lead to the enhancement of the immediate setting and therefore the proposal is acceptable subject to 5 sub-criteria that must be also met. Criterion i) is most relevant and requires that the development represents no significant adverse effects to the intrinsic value, beauty, open character and landscape character of the countryside location.
- 8.5. Criterion ii – v of Policy DM4 of the SADMP would not be relevant to this application as the proposal would not undermine the separation between settlements, not create or exacerbate ribbon development and is not located in the Green Wedge or the National Forest.
- 8.6. Policy DM10 of the adopted SADMP states that developments will be permitted where they complement or enhance the character of the surrounding area with regard to scale, layout, density, mass, design, materials and architectural features.
- 8.7. Guidance Point C1 of the NDG confirms that well-designed new development should respond positively to the features of the site itself and the surrounding context beyond including the existing built development and landscape character, amongst others. Guidance Point I1 of the NGD highlights that new developments should consider the composition of street scenes and individual buildings and their elements including the height, scale, massing and relationship between buildings, as well as views, vistas, landmarks, and landscaping, amongst others.
- 8.8. This application is for the erection of a detached garage to serve The Hayloft, 1 Boston Sidings, Bull In The Oak. Planning Permission for the erection of garage on a similar quantum at the application site was refused in 2025 (reference; 25/00660/HOU). Following the refusal the proposal has been reduced in depth from 8.00 metres to 7.00 metres, reduced at the eaves from 3.40 metres to 3.20 metres, increased at the ridge from 3.85 metres to 4.75 metres to accommodate a dual-pitched form, set 0.50 metres further in from the boundary and the external materials altered from metal cladding to timber cladding.
- 8.9. The Councils Good Design Guide states that *'Garages and car ports should generally be set back from the existing building so as not to dominate the streetscene'*
- 8.10. The proposed garage would remain to be sited forward of the perceived principal frontage of the dwelling. The plot itself and particularly the garden to the front of the dwelling play an important part of the setting of the development as the area is highly visible from the highway. Whilst the garden is bounded by fencing the perception of open space allows clear views to the dwelling beyond which by virtue of its design is a high quality asset to the area and this in part is due to the courtyard style arrangement and its setting within the wider complex of agrarian themed dwellings.
- 8.11. The Good Design Guide states that *'corner plots play an important role in the establishment of a local street scene and overdevelopment on corner plots can create an oppressive quality and lead to a change in the character of a place.'*
- 8.12. As acknowledged within the 2025 Officer Report, while the dwelling is not considered a corner plot, the front garden occupies a prominent corner position within the complex and thus the design of the garage should follow the design principles of the Good Design Guide. The proposed garage would measure 7.00

metres in depth and 12.00 metres in width remaining to be of a substantial footprint which alongside its incorporation of a dual-pitched roof at 4.57 metres in height would appear bulky and not subordinate to its surroundings. Its scale, massing and form would in turn over-dominate the street scene, a harmful impact further exacerbated by its prominent siting.

- 8.13. In addition, the considerable 12.00-metre-wide side elevation being the first aspect visible when entering the complex and highly prominent to pedestrians and passing drivers remains to lack any meaningful fenestration or architectural detailing. This further contributes to the proposal's harmful and unsympathetic character.
- 8.14. The submitted Planning Statement references a nearby garage outbuilding that was permitted previously at 5 Boston Sidings (Ref: 22/00629/HOU) in attempt to justify the proposal. This previously approved development is, however, not considered to be comparable, particularly given its notably different positioning within the complex and offers no justification for support of this application. Furthermore, the scheme at no.5 highlights the prominence of garages and is not considered to represent a good design feature to be replicated at No.1 Boston Sidings given that the orientation of the garden and further enclosure to the front of the development would harm the character of the development.
- 8.15. Overall, whilst amendments have been made to overcome the LPA's concerns addressed within the 2025 refusal, these are not considered to be significant with regards to the scale and siting of the garage. The garage remains to be visually dominant regrettably becoming the focal point of an otherwise well designed, unique, agrarian scheme which would erode the quality it currently hosts. It would neither complement nor enhance the countryside in this regard and would instead be seen as an incongruous feature. By virtue of the above, the proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies DM4 and DM10 of the adopted SADMP, the Councils Good Design Guide, the NDG and the NPPF.

Impact upon the significance and setting of the Grade II listed building ('The Old Farmhouse', Bull in the Oak)

- 8.16. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a duty on the local planning authority when considering whether to grant planning permission to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural and historic interest which it possesses.
- 8.17. Policies DM11 and DM12 of the adopted SADMP seek to protect and enhance the historic environment and heritage assets. All proposals for extensions and alterations of listed buildings will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that the proposals are compatible with the significance of the building. Development proposals should ensure the significance of a conservation area is preserved and enhanced.
- 8.18. The Bull in the Oak Farmhouse is located a relatively short distance to the east of the application site. The Farmhouse dates from the late 18th century and is a grade II listed building of special historic and architectural interest. Whilst its heritage significance is inherent in its built form, it does also draw some significance from its predominantly rural setting which includes surrounding agricultural fields and converted agricultural buildings formerly associated with its use and function. The application property is one of five modern dwellings constructed on part of the former farm complex. The dwellings have a combination of traditional and contemporary designs which positively reflect the former agricultural use of the site. As a result, the dwellings and the application site subject to this proposal are a positive presence within the setting of the listed building.

- 8.19. The proposed structure's proximity to a Grade II listed building, combined with its positioning, scale and massing, disrupts the historic and rural character of the area by introducing an intrusive built form. This stark contrast undermines the heritage value of the setting and conflicts with local planning policies DM11 and DM12, which aim to protect such environments. The proposal is therefore considered to result in a significant adverse impact on the heritage asset. The harm to the designated heritage asset is considered to be less than substantial in terms of the NPPF.
- 8.20. The Council's Conservation Officer states that *'the garage as currently proposed would also likely be a minor negative presence within the wider setting of the listed Farmhouse, causing an adverse impact upon its heritage significance'*
- 8.21. Paragraph 213 of the NPPF seeks to ensure that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.
- 8.22. Paragraph 215 of the NPPF and Policies DM11 and DM12 of the adopted SADMP seeks to ensure that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
- 8.23. Public benefits may arise from many developments and can include anything that delivers economic, social, or environmental progress, as described in Paragraph 8 of the NPPF.
- 8.24. Public benefits may also include heritage benefits, as specified in Paragraph 20 of the Planning Practice Guidance (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment), such as:
- Sustaining or enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting.
 - Reducing or removing risks to a heritage asset.
 - Securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset in support of its long-term conservation.
- 8.25. It is not considered that there are any public benefits of the proposal. The scheme, in its entirety, is not considered to sustain or enhance the significance of the heritage asset or the contribution of its setting. Therefore, the proposal does not demonstrate any heritage benefits.
- 8.26. While the proposal may offer functional advantages for the occupier in allowing them to store agricultural and domestic equipment (the former for maintaining the paddock to the rear), these are private benefits and not public ones and are far outweighed by the harm that is caused to the setting of the listed farmhouse and therefore to the significance of the heritage asset.
- 8.27. In weighing the public benefits against the harm as required by paragraph 215 of the Framework it is evident that the harm to the setting of the listed farmhouse is such that the proposal is contrary to Policies DM11 and DM12 of the SADMP and the requirements of Section 16 of the NPPF and that the application should be refused.

Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity

- 8.28. Paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to ensure that developments create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible, which promote health and well-being, and a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

- 8.29. Policy DM10 of the adopted SADMP requires that development would not have a significant adverse effect on the privacy and amenity of nearby residents and occupiers of adjacent buildings.
- 8.30. The Councils Good Design Guide states that *'Habitable rooms within rear elevations of neighbouring properties should never be less than 21m apart.'* And that *'A habitable room within a rear elevation should ideally not be less than 8m from the blank side of a single storey neighbouring property, rising to 12m for a two storey property.'*
- 8.31. As the dwellings within the development are all mostly separated by a single carriageway and the minimum distance from the proposed garage to the nearest neighbouring dwelling is 21.00 metres over the shared site access there is not considered to be any loss of amenity in regard to loss of light, loss of privacy or overdominance according with Policy DM10 of the adopted SADMP and Paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF in this regard. No neighbouring objections have been received.

Impact upon parking provision and highway safety

- 8.32. Ultimately, development should not be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe, in accordance with Paragraph 116 of the NPPF.
- 8.33. Policy DM17 of the adopted SADMP supports development that would not have any significant adverse impacts on highway safety. Policy DM18 of the SADMP requires new development to provide an appropriate/justified level of parking provision.
- 8.34. Section 9 of the NPPF promotes sustainable transport. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that developments provide appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes, given the type of development and its location and a safe and suitable access to the site for all users. Any proposal should ensure that any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.
- 8.35. All proposals for new development and changes of use should reflect the highway design standards that are set out in the most up to date guidance adopted by the relevant highway authority. Currently this is the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG) (2024).
- 8.36. Table 16 of the LHDG requires roller-shutter garage doors to be set back from the highway boundary by a minimum of 5.50 metres.
- 8.37. The occupiers would utilise the existing access to obtain access to the proposed garage via the gate and hardstanding to the west of Boston Sidings. A new hardstanding would also be formed forward of the garages front (western) elevation which faces away from the highway boundary and towards the adjacent fields. With the above in mind, the proposal would bear no adverse impacts upon highway safety in accordance with Policy DM17 of the adopted SADMP and the LHDG.
- 8.38. The LHDG requires that double garages have a minimum internal footprint of 6.00 x 6.00 metres, with a minimum door width of 4.20 metres for a double door and 2.30 metres for two single doors. It also requires a four-bedroom dwelling to provide an off-street parking provision for a minimum of three vehicles.
- 8.39. The proposed garage would measure 6.43 metres x 11.42 metres internally with door widths of 3.00 metres, satisfying the LHDG. With this in mind, alongside the aforementioned integral double garage and the additional gravel-surfaced parking the level of off-street parking provision would be more than adequate to serve the

existing/resulting four bedroomed dwelling in accordance with Policy DM18 of the adopted SADMP and the LHDG.

Impact upon protected trees

- 8.40. Paragraph 136 of the (NPPF) (2024) seeks to ensure that existing trees that make an important contribution to the character and quality of environments are retained wherever possible.
- 8.41. Paragraph 187 of the NPPF requires that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:
- b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;
- 8.42. Policy DM6 of the adopted SADMP seeks to preserve and enhance features of nature conservation. It requires that such features should be retained, buffered and managed favourably to maintain their ecological value.
- 8.43. The submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment confirms that no trees would be removed as part of the scheme. The garage would fall within the roof protection zone of T1 (named as T2 within the confirmed tree preservation order reference; 23/00002/TPORD) the Councils Arboricultural Officer has nonetheless raised no objections to the scheme and is satisfied that the scheme can be delivered with appropriate safeguards.
- 8.44. Furthermore, the Councils Arboricultural Officer has states that *'If permission is granted, it should be subject to full compliance with the submitted Tree Protection Plan, including installation and retention of protective fencing/Construction Exclusion Zone prior to commencement, and use of the specified pad & beam foundation solution where works fall within the influence of T1.*
- 8.45. *For avoidance of doubt, all service runs/drainage must be routed outside the CEZ/RPAs, and any hard surfacing/landscaping within T1's RPA should be delivered using a clearly defined low-dig/no-dig specification within an Arboricultural Method Statement prior to commencing.'*
- 8.46. In light of the above, subject to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment being fully adhered to the proposed garage would not result in any significant adverse impacts, either during or post construction, on the long term viability or biodiversity or visual amenity value of the protected trees. The proposal would therefore accord with Policy DM6 of the adopted SADMP and Paragraphs 136 and 187 of the NPPF in this respect.

9. Equality implications

1. Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty. Section 149 states:-
- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
 - (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

2. Officers have taken this into account and given due regard to this statutory duty, and the matters specified in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 in the determination of this application.
3. There are no known equality implications arising directly from this development.

10. Conclusion

- 10.1. Notwithstanding that the proposal would not have any adverse impacts upon residential amenity, parking provision, highway safety or protected trees, the garage remains to be visually dominant regrettably becoming the focal point of an otherwise well designed, unique, agrarian scheme which would erode the quality it currently hosts. It would neither complement nor enhance the countryside in this regard and would instead be seen as an incongruous feature. Furthermore, in weighing the public benefits against the harm as required by paragraph 215 of the Framework it is evident that the harm to the setting of the listed farmhouse would not be outweighed.
- 10.2. By virtue of the above, the proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies DM4, DM10, DM11 and DM12 of the adopted SADMP, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (1990), the overarching principles of the NPPF and the NDG and would fail to have due regard for the Councils Good Design Guide. The proposal is therefore recommended for refusal on these grounds.

11. Recommendation

- 11.1 **Refuse planning permission** subject to the reasons at the end of this report.

11.2 Reasons

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its scale and massing, incongruous design and siting, fails to complement or enhance the character of the area and the surrounding countryside. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DM4 and DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2016), the principles outlined in the Council's Good Design Guide (2020), Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) and the National Design Guide (2019).
2. The development's close proximity to The Old Farmhouse, Bull in the Oak a Grade-II listed building, combined with its scale, massing and detailed design introduces an incongruous and visually harmful structure into the setting of a Grade II listed building. The proposal results in less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset and there are no public benefits that outweigh the harm that is caused. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DM11 and DM12 of the SADMP, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (1990) and the requirements of Section 16 of the NPPF.