

Parish: Snape With Thorp

Ward: Tanfield

5

Committee Date : 1 September 2022

Officer dealing : Mr Nathan Puckering

Target Date: 18 July 2022

Date of extension of time (if agreed): 2 September 2022

22/01264/LBC

Listed Building Consent for the construction of a garden room to the rear elevation of the dwelling.

At: Snape Castle Barn Snape Bedale North Yorkshire

For: Mrs Hanson.

The application is brought to Planning Committee at the request of a Member of the Council.

1.0 Site, Context and Proposal

- 1.1 Snape Castle Barn is a converted barn located approximately 75m east of Snape Castle, located in the village of Snape. The grade II listed C17th dovecote is located within the wider site just to the south of the dwelling and is now used as general storage. Prior to the early 20th century, Snape Castle Barn along with the range of other buildings directly to the west, including the listed former stables, all formed part of an agricultural unit. Owing to this relationship and ownership at the time of listing in 1966, all of the buildings are considered to be grade II curtilage listed. The site is also within the Snape Conservation Area and the Thorp Perrow registered park and garden.
- 1.2 The building itself has an L plan layout with two storeys. It was built using rubblestone with a grey slate roof. The conversion has been undertaken in a relatively sympathetic manner and the character of the old barn is still evident. Due to it being set back from the road and being located behind the impressive dovecote, unusually the dwelling isn't the focal point of the site and takes up an understated role in the built hierarchy.
- 1.3 This application is seeking permission for the construction of a garden room on the rear elevation of the building. This is to be constructed by a company specialising in these types of structures. On the most part the structure is timber, although the roof structure is mostly aluminium, with a roof lantern feature. After concerns were expressed regarding the design of the addition and the level of change to the character of the rear facade, slight changes were made by way of reducing the pitch of the roof and the removal of some decorative mouldings.
- 1.4 An application for planning permission has been submitted alongside this application for listed building consent.

2.0 Relevant Planning History

- 2.1 20/02896/FUL & 20/02897/LBC - Construction of an attached single storey double garage with boot room to front (south) elevation of the dwellinghouse - Granted (extant but not implemented)
- 2.2 22/01263/FUL - Construction of a garden room to the rear elevation of the dwelling - Pending Consideration

3.0 Relevant Planning Policies

- 3.1 As set out in paragraph 2 of the NPPF planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The law is set out at Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Local Plan Policy S1: Sustainable Development Principles
Local Plan Policy S7: The Historic Environment
Local Plan Policy E1: Design
Local Plan Policy E5: Development Affecting Heritage Assets
National Planning Policy Framework

4.0 Consultations

- 4.1 Parish Council - No comments received.
- 4.2 Historic England - Did not wish to offer any advice.
- 4.3 Council for British Archaeology - The CBA recommend that this application is withdrawn and revised in a way that would reduce the level of harm caused to the significance of the curtilage listed building. A revised scheme should be informed by the agricultural character of the site as opposed to imitating 18th century stylistic grandeur that is out of keeping with historic farm buildings.
- 4.4 Yorkshire Gardens Trust - The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to the construction of the garden room as proposed, and trust that the paint finish will be of a subdued and sympathetic colour for this historic setting. However, as we noted in our letter of 16th August 2020 (20/01545/FUL), that although views from the property are important, it is equally important that reciprocal views from the registered park and garden are also conserved. As the room will have year-round use, (Statement at 7.1) we do have some concerns about light being shed and if possible, it would be beneficial to have some additional trees planted that would soften the views of the extension and the lighting, from the registered park.
- 4.5 Conservation Officer - Although it is concluded that no public benefit could be identified to outweigh the harm caused it is noted that there lies an extant permission for a single storey extension in the same location granted under planning application reference 20/01546/LBC and 20/01545/FUL decision date 18/09/2020. This extant permission would allow for a more modern structure attached to this curtilage listed building and this design is more preferable to the one proposed. The one proposed is considered to be an alien feature to the northern elevation and does not take into account the aesthetics of the host dwelling.
- 4.6 The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings & The Ancient Monuments Society were both consulted but submitted no comments.
- 4.7 Site Notice & Neighbour Notification - No comments received.

5.0 Analysis

- 5.1 The main issue to consider is the impact on the significance of the Listed Building.
- 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 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 Any harm identified must be given great weight in the determination of the application.
- 5.5 The significance of the listed building in question is mainly derived from its historic and architectural interest. It historically formed an agricultural unit along with the other buildings to the west and despite this use having clearly ceased some time ago, there is still some historic interest to be derived from this relationship.
- 5.6 The architectural merit of the building is also a major contributing factor to its overall significance.
- 5.7 As noted in the introductory section of this report, the conversion of the barn has been relatively sympathetic. A lot of the original openings have been retained, and although two large, glazed arches have been introduced, on the whole the elevations have retained an uncomplicated and plain appearance. This defines the overall character and appearance of the building.
- 5.8 The proposed garden room is not in keeping with this overall defining character. Its design has several complex features to it, such as the roof lantern, the bulky facias and the rather thick pilaster-like elements. These equate to an extension which is fundamentally different in character and appearance to the host building.
- 5.9 It is noted that an accepted approach to extending listed buildings is often to have a contrasting style to the historic features of the building, to clearly delineate old and new. However, in those instances the design tends to be contemporary to present a high-quality modern addition. In this case, the extension does not achieve this aim and rather has the character of a traditional conservatory that one would expect to find on mid-C20th dwellings or larger stately homes.
- 5.10 The substantial appearance of the garden room and its siting on an otherwise simple façade, and the fact it will almost fully cover one of the first-floor windows, will completely alter the massing of this aspect of the building and further interrupt the uncomplicated, almost symmetrical nature, of the building's rear elevation. This again will be to the detriment of the overall character and appearance of the listed building.

- 5.11 This is considered to equate to less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building by way of the harm to its architectural merit. The NPPF and policy E5 of the Local Plan dictates that in order for this to be acceptable, it must be outweighed by public benefit. On this occasion there will be no public benefit arising from the scheme to offset the identified harm. As such, it is not considered to be acceptable.
- 5.12 Throughout discussions with Officer's, the applicant and agent have referred to the fact there is extant permission for an extension in the same place, but this cannot be implemented due to the approved design in actuality being unable to be constructed. This is noted but cannot be used to justify a harmful addition to the listed building. In any event, every application must be assessed on its own merits. It should be further noted that the earlier permission was approved under the now defunct Local Development Framework.
- 5.13 Refusal is recommended on the basis that the development conflicts with policy E5 of the Local Plan and the NPPF.

6.0 Recommendation

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

The reasons are:-

1. Due to its inappropriate design that is in conflict with the character of the listed building, the development would harm the architectural merit of the heritage asset. This will equate to less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building that will not be outweighed by any public benefit. The proposal is therefore in direct conflict with policy E5 of the Local Plan, as well as section 16 of the NPPF.