

**Parish: Thimbleby**  
Ward: Osmotherley & Swainby  
**10**

Committee date: 25 July 2019  
Officer dealing: Mrs H Laws  
Target date:

**18/02647/LBC**

**Listed Building Consent for internal alterations to dwelling; construction of a two storey extension; replacement windows and doors; and alterations to stables to form holiday accommodation**

**At: Woodlands Farm, Thimbleby**

**For: Mr & Mrs Paul and Amy Callin**

**This application is referred to Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Hugill.**

## **1.0 SITE, CONTEXT AND PROPOSAL**

- 1.1 The dwelling, which is a grade II listed building, lies on the northern side of the village street at the western end of the village. The dwelling fronts onto the highway together with its annexe, which is a converted single storey outbuilding to the side. To the rear of the dwelling is a courtyard formed by stables along the northern and eastern sides, with units of holiday accommodation along the western side.
- 1.2 Vehicular access into the property is at the western end of the site leading into a parking area at the rear of the dwelling. Agricultural land, paddocks and an equestrian ménage lie beyond the curtilage of the buildings to the north and west; a neighbouring property lies to the east.
- 1.3 The existing two storey dwelling is a grade II listed building with a modern single storey rear extension. The building is stone with a pantiled roof. The attached annexe is in use as a unit of holiday accommodation, separated from the main part of the dwelling by a dining room. The annexe is attached to the stable block but with no internal connection. There are currently several loose boxes along the eastern and northern boundaries of the central courtyard. There are three units of holiday accommodation within the shorter western and corner section of the courtyard.
- 1.4 The application includes several proposals for development, which are listed as follows:
  - A two storey extension to the rear of the dwelling to replace an existing single storey extension. The extension would be finished in sandstone (reclaimed where possible) and interlocking pantiles
  - The creation of first floor accommodation within the roofspace above the existing single storey annexe to provide staff accommodation
  - The creation of a unit of holiday accommodation within the roofspace above the stables in the east wing
  - The construction of a glazed extension to the east elevation of the stables to provide a fire escape for the above holiday unit
  - The insertion of 12no. rooflights in the roofs above the annexe and holiday unit to serve the proposed accommodation

- Replace the upvc windows (8no.) and french doors on the front elevation with timber framed sash windows and timber framed glazed door. 3no. windows would be 3 over 3 paned sash; 5no. windows would be 2 over 2 paned sash. The french doors would be 3 panes wide and 3 deep.
- Replace the existing front door with a 6 panel timber door
- Replace the existing front boundary fence with an 1800mm high timber close boarded fence and trellis, with the existing low wall immediately to the front of the dwelling retained and repaired.
- Insertion of two rooflights in the existing kitchen lean to roof on the rear elevation of the dwelling
- Replace existing upvc windows with timber framed windows in the rear elevation of the dwelling
- Re-instate a window opening on the front elevation of the annexe and install a timber framed 2 over 2 paned window
- Replace existing roof tiles on the main dwelling with traditional pantiles
- Rebuild existing chimneys with traditional materials
- Reinststate original stone kneelers on the gable ends of the existing dwelling
- Replace all existing gutters and downpipes with aluminium gutters and downpipes

## **2.0 RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY**

- 2.1 02/01425/FUL – Ground floor extension to existing dwelling. Permission granted 28/10/2002.
- 2.2 06/00289/LBC – Application for listed building consent for internal alterations to existing dwelling. Consent granted 31/3/2006.
- 2.3 06/02229/FUL – Construction of a replacement domestic outbuilding. Permission granted 30/5/2007.
- 2.4 07/00767/CON – Application for conservation area consent to demolish existing outbuilding. Consent granted 15/5/2007.
- 2.5 13/02524/FUL - Alterations to existing annexe to form a holiday let and formation of a car parking area. Permission granted 4/2/2014.
- 2.6 13/02526/FUL & 13/02565/LBC - Alterations to existing garage and stable building to form 2 holiday units. Planning permission and listed building consent granted 23/5/2014.
- 2.7 15/00243/FUL & 15/00226/LBC - Demolition of garage/utility/toilet building and construction of stone built building to form a self-contained holiday unit and 2no bed and breakfast units. Planning permission and listed building consent granted 7/4/2015.

## **3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES**

3.1 The relevant policies are:

Core Strategy Policy CP16 - Protecting and enhancing natural and man-made assets  
Core Strategy Policy CP17 - Promoting high quality design  
Development Policies DP28 - Conservation  
Development Policies DP32 - General design  
National Planning Policy Framework

#### 4.0 CONSULTATIONS

4.1 Parish Council – does not support either application for the following reasons:

- The fire escape on the side of the conversion to self-catering is incorrectly positioned being to the side of the property with any escapees entering a dangerous area of the generator building

4.2 Public comments – the following comment has been received from the neighbouring residents:

The current application for the fire escape is totally unsuitable for the area. It is within 8 metres of our main entrance and in full view of the conservatory and back porch. We consider this to be a loss of amenity as we currently look out on plain stonework. The glass and timber structure will totally dominate our outlook and can only detract from the stonework in our yard.

We think the applicant has not researched the options of an internal fire escape on the other side of the building.

4.3 Letters of support have been received from Welcome to Yorkshire, Beaver Furniture, Green Tourism and guests of the business, which are summarised as follows:

This business has the prestigious green tourism award and is working hard to help establish itself as a leading sustainable business and support the whole of Yorkshire in being a strong sustainable and high-quality green destination

- Woodlands farm is seeking to gain a higher green award help put Yorkshire on the map as a forward thinking destination and would like to attract more of the growing green pound
- feel that the proposed changes would enhance the listed property; significant improvement to what's currently there
- the proposed addition of a guest lounge to Woodlands Farm would be an extremely positive enhancement and this seems to be a creative use of what is now seemingly just roof space above the stables
- provides support for local businesses

#### 5.0 OBSERVATIONS

5.1 The main issue to consider is the impact of the proposed development on the historic fabric of the heritage asset and the impact of the proposed changes on the significance of the heritage asset.

5.2 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that in determining a planning application for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the Local Planning Authority shall have special regard to the

desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

- 5.3 The National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 195 and 196 requires an assessment of the potential harm a proposed development would have upon the significance of a designated heritage asset and requires that harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing the optimum viable use of the building.
- 5.4 The Heritage Statement submitted in support of the application outlines that the significance of the building lies within its example as a surviving 19th century farmhouse and associated farmstead. It goes on to define that the simple plan form and vernacular character provides the overall aesthetic appeal of the site.
- 5.5 The applicant's statement infers that previous developments on the site have served to detract from the building to such an extent that it would no longer meet the test of special architectural and historic interest for statutory designation. However, the statutory designation of the building is a matter for consideration by Historic England as the public body responsible for the protection of the historic environment and is not relevant to the consideration of this application as the buildings remain under the protection of the statutory listing.
- 5.6 There are no objections to much of the proposed development including the removal and replacement of modern materials with more traditional materials, which would serve to preserve, and in places enhance, the special interest of the listed building and its setting.
- 5.7 As existing, the PVCu windows detract from the significance of the building and therefore, the principle of their replacement with timber alternatives is welcomed. Despite this, it is considered that the proposed '3 over 3' sash windows are inappropriate to the construction of the building and in themselves would result in a harmful impact.
- 5.8 The Heritage Statement outlines that there are various examples of 3 over 3 sash windows in the locality of the site and they have been recommended by various specialist window manufactures. Despite this, it is still considered that a 2 over 2 sash window would be more appropriate due to the proportions of the window openings. There is no evidence to suggest that the original windows had 3 over 3 panes.
- 5.9 There are no objections to the removal of the existing single storey extension, which is positioned to the rear of the dwelling, the roof of which is at a very low pitch and is causing maintenance issues. The extension is a later addition and is of no historic or architectural merit. However, the single storey, low height nature of the existing extension results in a low key development that has limited overall impact on the dominant character of the dwelling. The fact that the extension is of single storey and of lean-to design allows it to be understood as subservient to the building and allows for the retention of an understanding of its predominant historic form. The proposed two-storey extension to the rear of the property would introduce a more complex, cross-gabled design that would detract from the overall simplicity of the building to an extent to which it would no longer be legible. As such, it is considered that this would result in less than substantial harm to the special interest of the listed building.
- 5.10 The applicant has outlined that they have had issues gaining buildings insurance due to the construction of the roof structure on the existing single storey extension to the rear of the property. However, this is not a material consideration for the Local Planning Authority; nor would this justify its replacement with a two storey structure. A replacement single storey structure could be considered in order to remedy any structural issues associated with the existing structure.

- 5.11 The proposed rear access staircase to the stables/holiday accommodation is located on the side elevation which, as existing, is a plain blank elevation. The Heritage Statement assesses that the elevation has been subject to previous alteration including the removal of a northward facing extension. Despite this, it is considered that it still provides a positive contribution to the overall interest of the listed building and site.
- 5.12 The proposed development introduces a fire escape at roof height with associated staircase to ground level. Concerns were raised about the impact that the proposed development would have upon what is otherwise a plain façade. The applicant was also asked to explore alternative options including the potential use of a compliant rooflight or provision of an internal staircase. The applicant subsequently revised the scheme to include a timber framed glazed covering around the stairs to a design inspired by a neighbouring property.
- 5.13 However, it is considered that this is not appropriate on a simple barn type structure, nor is a first floor access point reflective of historic stable blocks of this style and form. As such, it is considered that this would result in less than substantial harm to the special interest of the listed building.
- 5.14 Based on the above, it is considered that much of the proposed development would lead to less than substantial harm to the special interest of the listed building.
- 5.15 The National Planning Policy Framework at Paragraph 196 states 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 benefit of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
- 5.16 The public benefits of the proposal include supporting the rural economy as well as the removal of modern rainwater goods and their replacement with materials considered to be more suitable. Despite these benefits, the construction of the two storey extension to the rear of the property would facilitate a large master bedroom for the owners of the property. It is considered that this is an overtly private benefit. Furthermore, the applicant has also failed to demonstrate that the level of intervention into the stable block/holiday accommodation is necessary or that other alternative means of escape are not viable. It is appreciated that the intervention of a staircase into the courtyard area may also have an adverse impact on the significance of the heritage asset, but no information has been received to suggest that internal staircase would not be possible. Furthermore, although the replacement of the modern windows is welcomed, little weight can be afforded to this due to the inappropriate design of their proposed replacements.
- 5.17 It is considered that similar levels of public benefit could be achieved through a scheme which results in significantly less harm to the significance of the heritage asset.
- 5.18 The Local Development Framework Policies CP16 and DP28 require that developments preserve and enhance listed buildings, that requirement is not met in this case and the proposal is therefore also contrary to the policies of the LDF.
- 5.19 Overall therefore, it is considered that in that case, the public benefits of the proposal are not outweighed by a public benefit and therefore, the application is recommended for refusal on these grounds.

## **6.0 RECOMMENDATION**

6.1 That subject to any outstanding consultations permission is **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development is not consistent with the character and significance of the buildings and would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset. This harm would not be outweighed by a public benefit. The proposed development is considered to fail to accord with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and those of Core Policy CP16 and Development Policy DP28 of the adopted Hambleton Local Development Framework.