



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2019

by Elaine Gray MA(Hons) MSc IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G2713/Y/19/3233156

The Stables, Broughton Grange, High Street, Great Broughton TS9 7HE

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Chris Woodhams against the decision of Hambleton District Council.
 - The application Ref 18/02455/LBC, dated 14 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 4 March 2019.
 - The works proposed are described as 'listed building consent for alterations to the west elevation window to form a single door'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Although the application form referred to a proposal for double doors at the appeal site, the scheme subsequently changed to a single door only. I have therefore used the description of the proposal from the appeal form, as it describes the appeal proposal more accurately.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the special interest of Broughton Grange Farmhouse, a grade II listed building.

Reasons

4. The appeal site at the Stables comprises a wing that forms an L-shape to the main body of Broughton Grange Farmhouse. The Stables was converted for use as a dwelling, and forms a separate planning unit to the farmhouse. However, the listed building remains a single physical entity, including the Stables building.
5. The list description estimates that the building dates from around 1700. It stands at a storey and a half high, with a three bay sandstone frontage. The main door is located off-centre, with a flattened Tudor-arched lintel above. At first floor level, half-dormer windows are set into the pantiled gabled roof. The appellant suggests that the Stables is likely to date from the early 18th century, with the west lean-to having been added later. The attributes of the building reflect its agricultural origins, for example, the simple linear form, the plain, irregular openings, and the historic plan form, where it survives. The external materials, sandstone and pantile, reflect those of the main house.

6. As a whole, the listed building has undergone many alterations over the years but its overall historic form and simple, vernacular character remain legible. The significance of the heritage asset derives from its aesthetic value, and the clear architectural hierarchy between the house and the ancillary structure. The interrelationship between the former agricultural section and the farmhouse adds to the understanding of past farming practices and the historic evolution of the property.
7. I note that the Stables underwent extensive works in 2003, with the north elevation and roof being entirely replaced. However, the lean-to is a survival from an earlier phase, possibly pre-1857 according to the historic mapping evidence. There are a number of physical differences between the masonry of the house and the lean-to, but this is not usual, given that they may not be exactly contemporary with each other. Historically, the lean-to may or may not have been rebuilt, but this does not negate its contribution to the overall significance of the asset.
8. It is proposed to remove a small window from the west elevation of the lean-to, and insert a new door opening in its place. The window itself is a modern insert and is not significant. However, the proposal would require the removal of a section of stonework that, the evidence suggests, dates from around the mid-19th century or earlier. This loss of historic fabric would harm the significance of the building, and would therefore require clear and convincing justification.
9. The formation of the new doorway would also introduce an additional access to the building, where there is little evidence that any previously existed. This would change the form of the space within the lean-to substantially, in that it would become a through corridor rather than an enclosed room. By introducing this new means of circulation, the proposal would not respect the original function and internal plan of the building. This change would harm the ability to understand the ancillary nature of this room and its historic layout.
10. On balance, I therefore consider that the loss of the historic fabric and the disruption the historic plan form, as a result of the proposal, would harm the significance of the heritage asset.
11. Accordingly, therefore, the proposed works conflict with the overarching statutory duty as set out in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which must be given considerable importance and weight, and with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In addition, the scheme would conflict with Policy DP28 of the Hambleton District Council Local Development Framework Development Policies, insofar as it seeks to conserve historic heritage by preserving and enhancing listed buildings.
12. Although serious, the harm to the heritage asset in this case would be less than substantial, within the meaning of the term in paragraph 195 of the NPPF. Paragraph 196 requires that, where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The proposed new door would undoubtedly bring advantages for the appellants in terms of the way they wish to arrange their living space. However, this would be a private benefit and so would not weigh in favour of the appeal proposal. I accept that the scale and design of the new door would reflect others present in the property, but this would not mitigate the concerns I have highlighted above.

13. I therefore find that insufficient public benefits have been identified that would justify or outweigh the harm I have identified to the heritage asset. The scheme therefore conflicts with the NPPF, which directs, at paragraph 193, that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed works would conflict with the development plan as a whole, and so the appeal is dismissed.

Elaine Gray

INSPECTOR