

Parish: Skipton-on-Swale
Ward: Thirsk
11

Committee date: 7 March 2019
Officer dealing: Miss Charlotte Cornforth
Target date: 11 March 2019

18/01731/LBC

**Listed building consent application for alterations and extension to existing dwellinghouse and outbuildings to form two dwellinghouses with associated hardstanding, new dividing wall and new access and gate from the eastern side following demolition of part of boundary wall
At Skipton Hall, Skipton on Swale
For Mr and Mrs Kitching**

1.0 SITE, CONTEXT AND PROPOSAL

- 1.1 The building of Skipton Hall is a Grade II listed building that was built in Georgian times by the Robb family, who were cattle drovers. The farm house was used by them as a resting place between Scotland and London.
- 1.2 In early Victorian times, the dwelling was extended (the eastern part with the lower roof line and two-storey height). The Victorians altered the windows to make a “two over two” glazing pattern and installed two large bay windows. Only two of the original Georgian windows remain on the ground floor of the west gable wall.
- 1.3 In the 1970s, the farm land was split off and Skipton Hall was left with only a large garden. In the 1980s, the building was run as a bed and breakfast/guest house before changing to a retirement home in 1990, an activity that ceased in 2002.
- 1.4 The house then became a holiday let and was rented out until 2005 when it reverted to private residential only. The house sits in relatively large gardens, with the principal outlook being towards the south.
- 1.5 The site is bounded by Catton Road to the east, the A61 to the north and the residential properties of Hill Farmhouse, Barrington House and Appletree House to the north east. There is open land to the east and south east beyond the Hall’s own garden and the south is a detached property, Swale House. St John’s Church is on the northern side of the A61, some 80 metres from the site entrance.
- 1.6 The proposal seeks to sub-divide the dwelling to create an additional dwelling for the owners to occupy. The proposed new dwelling would be formed within a later extension to the eastern side of the main house. The space between the eastern side of the house and the outbuildings would be infilled with a single storey extension and with the outbuildings forming part of the residential dwelling.
- 1.7 The existing space within the dwelling would comprise a bedroom (with en-suite) and dining room at ground floor, with two bedrooms and bathrooms at first floor. It should be noted that this part of the house has an existing staircase. The extension would provide a kitchen and utility. The outbuilding would comprise the entrance hall, with cloak room, WC and sitting room.
- 1.8 The new dwelling would therefore form a three-bedroom dwelling, with a bedroom at ground floor level. The existing dwelling would form a 7/8 bedroom dwelling. The details of the internal works to the Grade II listed building are:
 - A small opening between the bedroom and en-suite at first floor;
 - The insertion of a wall at first floor to allow for the dwellings to be sub-divided;
 - An opening into the utility room that will be part of the larger dwelling;

- The insertion on an en-suite at ground floor level;
- A knock-through from the existing external wall into the kitchen extension; and
- The existing door that currently goes from the kitchen into the hall would be retained on the existing dwelling side, but would have a new wall built on the side to the new dwelling.

1.9 Vehicular access to the site is proposed on the southern side of the A61, between Appletree House and Barrington House using an existing access point. The wall would be demolished to allow for the access onto the application site. The relevant ownership certificates have been signed on this basis. A hard standing area would be created for vehicles to park and access the new dwelling.

1.10 The existing entrance to the building is accessed from the public highway and would continue to be. The existing gravel drive and hard standing to the rear of the dwelling would remain with the main house. A new wall would be constructed to the side of the existing utility and the outbuilding to screen off the second dwelling from the main house.

2.0 RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

2.1 2/99/133/0014D - Application for Listed Building Consent for the part re-roofing of and repairs to existing roof; Granted 1999.

2.2 2/02/133/0014E - Listed Building Consent for demolition of part of wall; Granted 2002.

2.3 2/03/133/0014F - Application for Listed Building Consent for demolition of part and infilling of part of existing boundary wall; Granted 2003.

2.4 12/01873/LBC - Application for Listed Building Consent for installation of a window, replacement of 3 windows and re-pointing of west facing gable; Granted 2012.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

3.1 The relevant policies are:

Core Strategy Policy CP16 - Protecting and enhancing natural and man-made assets
Development Policy DP28 – Conservation
National Planning Policy Framework

4.0 CONSULTATIONS

4.1 Parish Council – No response received to date.

4.2 Council for British Archaeology – No comments received to date.

4.3 Public comments – Four letters of objection have been received from two addresses. A summary of their objections are:

- Appletree House is accessed by a regulated access road from the A61. The access is for and was planned for two dwellings (Appletree House & Barrington House);
- Traffic on the A61 is already a risk due to the extreme speeds of some drivers. Additional traffic exiting/entering would increase the risk of and incident or accident. The build of a new property directly opposite has in effect turned the exit into a crossroads;

- The driveway as it is presently, is bordered its full length by allocated parking for Barrington House. Parking extends from the pavement right up to within 32cm of the boundary wall at the top (clearly marked by paved/gravel area). This can accommodate 3-4 cars and when these spaces are in use and those of Appletree House, the area reaches its capacity and feels crowded;
- There is already access to Skipton Hall off the much quieter (in comparison to the A61) Catton Road so there is no justification for the new access, which would cause damage to the Grade II listed boundary wall. There has never been an access road to Skipton Hall in this location;
- The proposed road would mean installing gates in part of the Grade II listed building's wall, altering the look of the property and also those of their neighbours;
- This is currently a very beautiful walled garden. The character and history of the garden would be lost;
- If construction traffic for the proposed development were to use the access road between Appletree & Barrington houses many of the points above would be magnified seven fold, especially those regarding safety, noise and privacy but also an increased danger of damage to building and property given the road is not be suitable for any vehicles other than domestic ones;
- The proposed access would have a dominating impact on the use and quiet enjoyment of Barrington House.

5.0 OBSERVATIONS

- 5.1 The main issue to consider is the impact of the proposals upon the heritage asset of the Grade II listed building

Heritage assets

- 5.2 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the Council to have special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building affected by the proposal or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
- 5.3 Case law leads to an approach that any degree of harm to the significance of a heritage asset or the setting of a heritage asset where that setting contributes to significance must give "considerable weight and importance" in decision making.
- 5.4 The heritage asset which will be affected by this application is the Grade II listed building of Skipton Hall. The listed building is a detached dwelling within a small settlement which has been designated because of its special architectural or historic interest.
- 5.5 As defined by the NPPG glossary, significance is the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting. The setting of a heritage asset is defined in the NPPF as the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.
- 5.6 Great weight and importance is given to the significance of the heritage asset. The significance of the building lies with its historic value as a farm house that was used by the Robb as a resting place between Scotland and London and aesthetic value as a grand three storey Georgian building, built with red brick with a Flemish Bond under a slate roof.

- 5.7 The building was extended by the Victorians (the eastern part with the lower roof line and two storey height). This extension has its own separate staircase to the upper part of the house and is considered to be the least historic and significant part of the building.
- 5.8 The infill extension would be single storey, with a flat roof and glazed lantern. It would not project further than the southern elevation of the main dwelling. It would be constructed from brick. The outbuilding would be altered to include double floors on the eastern elevation that would form the entrance to the dwelling. This would be formed through an existing window opening. In terms of the utility room the north, a new entrance door is proposed to enter the larger dwelling.
- 5.9 The proposal seeks to extend this eastern part of the house through the infill extension and alterations to the outbuildings. It is considered that the proposal would not harm the significance of the Grade II listed building. The most significant part of the Georgian building would be retained and its aesthetic value would not change. The extension is a light weight, mainly glazed structure that has been kept to single storey in height.
- 5.10 These works are considered to be minor and the significance of the Grade II listed building and overall plan form is retained as well as the historic and architectural significance of the building. Retaining the existing door is welcomed
- 5.11 A three metre section of the boundary wall would be demolished to incorporate the access through to the proposed new dwelling. This wall is of an age and is curtilage listed. It forms the boundary between the neighbour's dwellings to the north and encloses Skipton Hall to create a walled garden area. This wall is visible from the public realm and its part demolition would result in a change in the enclosed nature of the garden and the listed building.
- 5.12 The agent has advised that they require separate vehicular access to serve this property because the existing dwelling that will be retained is of a size that is desirable to have its own access and parking area. This part demolition of the wall was granted listed building consent in 2002. This was based on the fact there was special justification to improve the exit from the premises. The 2002 report acknowledged that the wall within the grounds of the Hall is a feature worthy of retention. However, a new access point off Catton Road, to the north of the former access has since been implemented that improved the exit to the site.
- 5.13 There is an existing vehicular access that serves Skipton Hall at present with on-site turning and car parking. Officers are of the opinion that this area can be utilised for the second dwelling. This has suggested to the agent during the course of the application. The agent has advised that they do not want to do this as it is more desirable for each dwelling to have its own access point.
- 5.14 When considering the impact of proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Where a development would lead to less than substantial harm, paragraph 196 of the NPPF states that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. This includes, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
- 5.15 There is no clear and convincing justification for the proposed works. It is considered that the part demolition of the wall would cause harm but this is less than substantial harm in the terms of the NPPF. The creation of an additional dwelling is a public benefit. However, this benefit is not great enough to outweigh the harm to the heritage asset is therefore contrary to the provisions of the NPPF.

Planning balance

- 5.16 It is considered that the part demolition of the wall would cause harm but this is “less than substantial harm” in the terms of the NPPF. However, there no public benefits identified in terms of this listed building consent application and the potential public benefit of an additional dwelling cannot be realised in view of the recommendation to refuse application 18/01663/FUL.
- 5.17 The internal works to the Grade II listed building, the infill single storey extension and alterations to the outbuildings to form two dwellings, with associated hardstanding and a new dividing wall are considered to not harm the significance of the heritage asset. However, in the absence of planning permission, the works to the listed building will be unable to go ahead.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 That subject to any outstanding consultations permission is **REFUSED** for the following reason:
1. The demolition of part of the listed curtilage wall is considered to result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the enclosed nature of the garden, and the significance of the Grade II listed building, without clear and convincing justification in accordance with paragraph 194 of the NPPF. No public benefits have been found to arise from the development and therefore it is not possible for the 'less than substantial harm' to be outweighed, therefore is contrary to the provisions paragraph 196 of the NPPF. The development has a detrimental impact upon the interest of a natural or man-made asset that is contrary to Policy CP16 and it fails to preserve or enhance the Grade II listed building, contrary to DP28 of the Hambleton Local Development Framework.