

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

5

19/01266/LBC

**Construction 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 Georgiana 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. Reinststate service stairs to the kitchen area of the house
 - v Remove chimney breast in kitchen and upstairs to form opening to orangery
 - vi. Remove kitchen stone floor and possible reuse
 - vii. Undertake numerous internal decorative work and re-arrange some rooms
 - viii. 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
Development Policies DP32 - General design

4.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 4.1 Crayke Parish Council - neither supports or objects to the planning application
- 4.3 Public comments - 3 representations have been received supporting the proposal.
Comments include reference to the beauty of the home
That the works are necessary to modernise the dwelling
The kitchen is too small for a family home
The kitchen is the hub of any home and need to offer a practical solution for modern families
The reinstatement of the windows on the front is noted to enhance the property.
The orangery will complement the Georgian home.

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 issue to consider is:
- o the impact upon the significance of the heritage asset

Heritage Assets

- 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 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.
- 5.5 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.
- 5.6 The heritage asset which will be affected by this application is the Grade II listed Crayke Cottage.
- 5.7 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.
- 5.8 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.
- 5.9 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.

- 5.10 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.
- 5.11 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.
- 5.12 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. The chimney breast is shown to be removed from the bathroom above the kitchen. Guidance of English Heritage identifies that chimney breasts and staircases are the highly significant parts of a building. Removal of a chimney breast requires very careful consideration due to the significance of such a feature to an historic building.
- 5.13 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 house and 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 the applicant's desire to adapt the house for contemporary living through the creation of a living/dining/cooking area for the family to enjoy.
- 5.14 The change to the surface of the kitchen floor which provides evidence of the original character of the kitchen is significant and harm as it provides evidential value of the history of the building and highlights the position of the former servant stairs.
- 5.15 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.
- 5.16 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.

Planning balance

- 5.17 Harm is found to arise from the removal of the rear wall of the kitchen and the alteration to the kitchen floor. The reinstatement of the windows the front of the dwelling are found to be beneficial. However it is not necessary to make the harmful alterations to the rear of the dwelling to achieve the benefits of the reinstatement of the windows in the front. The harmful alterations to the rear in the kitchen and bathroom above are to achieve private benefits not public benefits. The harm to the heritage asset arising from the proposals is not outweighed by public benefit.

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.