

Parish: Crayke
Ward: Easingwold

Committee Date : 17 October 2019
Officer dealing : Mr Rowshon Uddin
Target Date: 20 August 2019
Date of extension of time (if agreed): 20 September 2019

4

19/01265/FUL

**Erection of single storey rear extension. Internal and external alterations including repositioning of oil tank.
at Crayke Cottage Church Hill Crayke North Yorkshire
for S Walker.**

This application is referred to Planning Committee at the request of a Ward Member.

1.0 SITE, CONTEXT AND PROPOSAL

- 1.1 Crayke Cottage is located within the centre of the village of Crayke. Crayke Cottage is a detached Georgian era house with an associated coach house and garage within the curtilage. It is set back from the road behind a front garden with a mature hedge and stone garden wall to the front. There is a large private rear garden with a public footpath that runs to the west boundary of Crayke Cottage to housing to the south side of Crayke.
- 1.2 Crayke Cottage was added to the list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest at Grade II in 1984. The building is a grade II Listed Building. The site also falls within the Crayke Conservation Area, and the Howardian Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- 1.3 The proposal involves the following list of works;
- i. Erect new orangery to the rear of the property
 - ii. Alter the terrace around the proposed orangery
 - iii. Unblock 2 windows facing the street
 - iv. Reinstate service stairs to the kitchen area of the house
 - v. Reposition oil tank in rear garden
 - vi. Remove chimney breast in kitchen (and upstairs bathroom) to form opening to orangery
 - vii. Remove kitchen stone floor and possible reuse
 - viii. Undertake numerous internal decorative work and re-arrange some rooms
 - ix. General maintenance and upgrade of the house

2.0 RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

- 2.1 None relevant

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

- 3.1 The relevant policy of the Development Plan and any supplementary planning policy advice are as follows;

Core Strategy Policy CP1 - Sustainable development
Core Strategy Policy CP16 - Protecting and enhancing natural and man-made assets
Core Strategy Policy CP17 - Promoting high quality design
Development Policies DP1 - Protecting amenity
Development Policies DP28 - Conservation

4.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 4.1 Crayke Parish Council - neither supports or objects to the planning application
- 4.2 Highways North Yorkshire – recommend an informative note that no works are to be undertaken which will create an obstruction, either permanent or temporary, to the Public Right of Way adjacent to the proposed development.
- 4.3 Public comments - 3 representations have been received supporting the proposal, two noting that the proposal would improve a the property and make it suitable for modern living for bring new family to the locality. The reinstatement of the windows on the front is noted to enhance the property.

5.0 ANALYSIS

- 5.1 The issues to be considered for this proposal are guided by Hambleton's Local Development Framework or LDF.
- 5.2 The main issues to consider are:
 - o Heritage Assets and Conservation Area
 - o Quality of design reflecting the appearance of the house and the character of its locality
 - o Impact upon the amenity of neighbours

Heritage Assets and Conservation Area

- 5.3 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.
- 5.4 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the Council to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Crayke Conservation Area.
- 5.5 Policy CP16 from the Core Strategy Document of Hambleton's Development Plan says developments or other initiatives will be supported where they preserve and enhance the District's natural and man-made assets. Policy DP28 protects harmful changes to the character and appearance of the Hambleton's defined Conservation Areas.
- 5.6 The National Planning Policy Framework at paragraphs 189, 190 and 192 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.
- 5.7 The heritage asset which will be affected by this application is the Grade II listed Crayke Cottage.
- 5.8 The main issues are therefore whether the proposals are appropriate and would maintain the features of special architectural or historic interest of the Listed Building, and whether that impact would harm the contribution made by the property to the character and visual amenity of the Crayke Conservation Area.

- 5.9 The significance of heritage assets is defined in the National Planning Policy Framework as, '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.
- 5.10 In this regard the historic interest of Crayke Cottage is considered to be high, on the basis it is a sound example of early-mid 19th century "polite" minor gentry residence that is part of the later development of the village of Crayke with evidence of mid-late 19th century extensions through the erection of the side wings.
- 5.11 At Crayke Cottage architectural interest contributes strongly to the overall significance of the site due to the 'polite' design of the dwelling with Georgian character set within extensive grounds including traditional coach house and outbuildings and the extensive Georgian character internally.
- 5.12 On assessment of the application it is considered that the proposal would lead to the harm of the house. The scope of harm is measured from less than substantial to substantial. The harm caused by this development would be less than substantial but on the acute end of the scale.
- 5.13 The identified harm comes from the proposal to remove a substantial part of the back wall of the dwelling and the chimney breast would be removed to link the kitchen with the living space in the proposed orangery.
- 5.14 The floor provides original character to the kitchen and evidential value because it highlights the position of the former servant stairs.
- 5.15 The chimney breast provides architectural value to the internal design of Georgian houses and its materials provide further evidential value of construction and possibly construction methods employed then. Its loss would harm the kitchen's authenticity and would be irreversible. Other options to link the kitchen with the orangery were proposed by the case officer but dismissed by the applicant as inadequate to meet their design objectives, this is their desire to adapt the house for contemporary living through the creation of a living/dining/cooking area for the family to enjoy
- 5.16 The proposed orangery, terrace alteration, re-siting of the oil tank, and a new hatch to the attic to the property were assessed as not having a harmful impact on the significance of the heritage asset.
- 5.17 Assessment of the unblocking of the 2 front windows, the reinstatement of the service staircase to the first floor, replacement of concrete paving with York stone would enhance the significance of the property.
- 5.18 As such, the improved appearance of Crayke Cottage would enhance its contribution to the quality of the visual amenity of Crayke Conservation Area.
- 5.19 Harm is found to arise from the removal of the rear wall of the kitchen. No public benefit has been found to justify and outweigh the harm the works will have upon the significance of a designated heritage asset.

Quality of design reflecting the appearance of the house and the character of its locality

- 5.20 Policies CP17 and DP32 require the highest quality of creative, innovative and sustainable design for buildings and landscaping that take account of local character

and settings, promote local identity and distinctiveness and are appropriate in terms of use, scale, material and design.

- 5.21 The scale, material and design of the orangery are sympathetic to the character of the host property. The replacement of composite soil pipes and rainwater goods with cast iron products will enhance the character and appearance of the property. By unblocking the 2 front windows the appearance of Crayke Cottage would be enhanced.
- 5.22 The proposed work would reflect the appearance and character of the house to the benefit of the area.

Impact upon the amenity of occupants

- 5.23 Policy CP1 from the Core Strategy Document sets out a list of principles to achieve sustainable development, from which DP1 is to protect the amenity of both occupants and its adjoining properties.
- 5.24 The Crayke Cottage site is spacious with adequate separation distance from adjoining neighbours to mitigate against any impact the proposed orangery, the reposition of the oil tank, the unblocking of the front windows or any other associated development might have to their amenity.

Planning balance

- 5.25 Assessment of this application finds that the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. However, the harm through the loss of the kitchen's original chimney breast and rear wall together with the and loss of the chimney breast at the first floor level above the kitchen is harmful. To a lesser extent the change to the kitchen stone floor would also cause harm to the architectural and evidential value of the Crayke Cottage. The harm caused by the loss of the historic fabric and change to the layout of the dwelling outweighs the benefits found through the restoration of the windows.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION:

- 6.1 That subject to any outstanding consultations the application be **REFUSED** for the following reason

The proposal fails to meet the requirements of the Local Development Framework Policies CP1, CP16, DP28 and the NPPF, as the changes that result in the loss of historic fabric of the dwelling would result in harm to the significance of the heritage asset. Any public benefits of development do not outweigh the harm to the significance of the heritage asset.