



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 6 July 2021

by Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N2739/D/21/3272230

The Coach House, Grimston Park, Grimston, Tadcaster LS24 9BY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr D Jenkins against the decision of Selby District Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/1152/HPA, dated 20 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of a mansard roof to replace current hipped and flat roof to one section of the Coach House.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing building and on the setting of a nearby listed building.

Reasons

Existing building

3. The Coach House is a single storey building with a large footprint that was converted to a dwelling following a grant of planning permission in 1980. The building was formerly a stable building used in connection with the adjacent dwelling at Grimston Lodge and the wider Grimston Park Estate. The south elevation of the dwelling abuts the edge of the shared access road into Grimston Lodge at a point close to the entrance gates of that building. The other elevations of the dwelling face onto landscaped gardens with mature tree planting. A stone wall demarcates the southern boundary of the garden with the access road. The site is surrounded by open countryside.
4. According to the appellant's heritage statement, the earliest parts of the appeal property are the central part, now occupied internally by the kitchen, and the two wings to the east and west. These elements have hipped roofs finished with Welsh slate and stone ridge pieces. There have been several additions to the building in more recent times including a flat roofed extension to the south (front) elevation of the east wing which extends this wing out to a point level with the aforementioned central part. An extension incorporating an entrance porch with a timber framed gable detail has been constructed forward of the south elevation of the west wing. This involved providing a new hipped roof with a flat top over both these elements. An orangery extension with a parapet

roof has been added to the west elevation of the older projecting element of the west wing.

5. Whilst some of the above alterations have altered its appearance to an extent, the building retains a distinctive character that is reflective of its past. Despite the variation in roof form, the orangery extension aside, a consistently low eaves line has been maintained for the full length of the building which, along with its rather squat and uniformly single storey nature, provides a high degree of coherence to the building. Furthermore, the flat roofed front extension, whilst not reflective of the traditional character of the site, has allowed the distinctive narrow hipped and slated roof form of the east wing, one of the earliest parts of the building, to be retained. This is a key component of the character of the building and is easily visible from the shared access road. This is reinforced by the appellant's heritage statement which advises that this roof is of significance due to it reflecting that of Grimston Lodge.
6. Policy H14 of the Selby District Local Plan (2005) ('the SDLP') states that, amongst other things, extensions to dwellings in the countryside will be permitted providing that they are appropriate to their setting, would not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling, would not dominate it visually and would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the dwelling and, where appropriate, other buildings in the area. Policy SP19 of the Selby Core Strategy (2019) ('the SCS') seeks to achieve high quality design with regard for local character and development that contributes positively to an area's identity in terms of scale, density and layout.
7. It is proposed to provide an additional storey above the existing east wing and attached flat roofed front extension. This would involve raising the eaves line of this element above that of the existing and providing a mansard style roof with a flat top, incorporating four roof windows to the sides. The roof pitch would be steep and extend to a height similar to that of the existing chimneys and beyond the highest part of the existing roof.
8. The proposed extension would represent a disproportionate addition to the host dwelling that, owing to the significant increase in height and the resulting bulk and massing, would cause the proposed extension to dominate the existing building. The raising of the eaves would be at odds with the consistency referred to above, whilst the loss of at least part of the narrow, hipped roof form would result in significant harm to the character of the building. The mansard style is not a feature of the existing building, nor have I been provided with any examples present in the immediate area.
9. I do not agree with the appellant that the roof form proposed would be similar to the parapet roof of the orangery or the flat-topped roof of the west wing which do not dominate the existing building. The bulky addition that would result would represent a discordant form of development that would not constitute good design and would be at odds with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling resulting in significant harm.
10. The site is not visible from the road or within the surrounding landscape. However, just because something is not visible in public views does not mean that it cannot cause harm or conflict with the policies referred to in paragraph 6. The proposal would be viewed by all users of the shared access road to Grimston Lodge and would be visible through the gates from the driveway of that building. It is also likely to be visible from the north western wing of this

building. Given the position of the proposal immediately adjacent to the access road and the bulk and massing of the proposed extension, it would be prominent in these views, despite the presence of trees referred to by the appellant.

11. The appellant argues that the proposal would result in a benefit, through removal of an unoriginal flat roof. I agree that there would be some minor benefit from the removal of this element, notwithstanding my conclusion at paragraph 5. However, any benefit would be greatly outweighed by the harm arising from the proposed mansard roof and the loss of at least part of the existing hipped roof.
12. The appellant has argued that there is a fallback position under permitted development, which is presumably through Class AA of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). Drawings showing alternative schemes of adding another storey have been provided. However, that permitted development right is subject to various limitations and conditions and there is insufficient evidence before me to reach a judgement regarding compliance in those respects. There is also no certificate of lawful development, for example, attesting clearly to what could be undertaken in any event, or indeed as to whether permitted development rights remain intact. By consequence the weight that I can accord such a fallback position is highly limited.
13. The appellant has referred to a planning permission from 2013¹ which allowed for the extension of a hipped roof over the flat roofed extension at the east wing in a similar manner to that carried out to the west wing. Whilst this would result in the loss of the narrow and hipped roof, it would appear to maintain the existing eaves line and would not result in a significant increase in height in contrast with the appeal proposal. It would also reflect a form of extension that already exists at the site. The appellant argues that the 2013 permission has been commenced and therefore remains extant and a realistic prospect, though the Council is silent on that matter. However, I have set out above that there are material differences between it and the scheme before me. I also note that permission has not been completed, over a period now amounting to some eight years. Those points collectively mean that I can only accord limited weight to this permission.
14. For the reasons outlined above, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing building and would therefore conflict with Policies ENV1 and H14 of the SDLP and Policy SP19 of the SCS.

Setting

15. Grimston Lodge is a Grade II listed building located to the east side of the access shared with the appeal site. It is a large detached house originating from the early nineteenth century with a hipped roof that is finished with slate. There are a number of later more recessive additions and alterations, including a number of detached buildings. Their recessive nature serve to emphasise the dominance of the main building which rises above all other buildings at the site. A number of the additions to the building, predominantly those forming the western wings to the building and which are visible from the access, have pantile roofs but reflect the hipped roof form of the main house.

¹ Ref 2013/0325/HPA

16. The significance/special interest of the listed building, in so far as it relates to this appeal, includes the evidential, aesthetic and historic value of a high-status example of a vernacular domestic building that is dominant within its setting and has been altered over time. Section 66 of the Act² sets out a general duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their settings. This is a matter of considerable importance and weight.
17. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') also provides that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The setting of a heritage asset is defined as the surroundings in which it is experienced and its importance therefore lies in what it contributes to the significance of the heritage asset.
18. On the approach along the shared main access road towards Grimston Lodge, its stone boundary walls and the pantile roofed elements forming the western wings of the building are visible on one side, whilst the east wing of The Coach House is visible on the other, close to the gated entrance. The low shallow roof form of the Coach House is reminiscent of that on the roof of Grimston Lodge, and indicative of their shared past and former functional relationship. As such, despite its conversion to a dwelling, its east wing still has the appearance of an ancillary structure that is recessive in appearance when compared to Grimston Lodge.
19. Given the historic relationship between the two buildings and the proximity of the Coach House to the main entrance, the appeal property forms part of the surroundings within which the listed building is experienced. Whilst I accept that the views between the main part of Grimston Lodge and the appeal property are limited, for the above reasons, the appeal site lies within the setting of the listed building. In this regard, the appeal property contributes to the significance of the listed building insofar as it is a former ancillary building close to the entrance and recessive in scale yet with a similar roof form of similar materials.
20. For the reasons outlined in paragraphs 8 and 9, the proposal would result in a bulky and unsympathetic addition to the Coach House, that would significantly increase the dominance of the Coach House on this part of the setting of the listed building and disrupt its appearance as a recessive and ancillary structure. This proposed roof form is not present at Grimston Lodge and is not a roof form that would be expected on a former ancillary building. In my view, such a roof form is more associated with grander buildings such as those examples provided by the appellant. As is evidenced in the appellant's Heritage Statement, the proposal would also result in the loss of the hipped roof form which is consistent with that of Grimston Lodge. This would impair the understanding of the historic and functional relationship between the two buildings to the detriment of the setting of the listed building.
21. The harm that would occur to the setting of the listed building would not be severe and therefore it would be 'less than substantial' within the meaning of the Framework. Paragraph 196 of the Framework nevertheless requires such harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. As reasoned at paragraph 11, the loss of the flat roof of the east wing would be a comparatively minor benefit.

² Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

22. I note that the appellant has advanced the proposal in order to provide a large open studio to support work as an artist/designer. I accept the proposal would be beneficial in those respects however such a benefit would be primarily a personal benefit and any public benefit would be limited.
23. A high level of harm to the setting of a Grade II listed building would arise from the proposal and great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets according to paragraph 193 of the Framework. In this context, the harm would not be outweighed by the minor public benefits considered above.
24. In conclusion, the proposal would result in a high level of residual harm to the setting of the listed building. It would therefore fail to preserve the setting of the listed building contrary to the requirements of s66(1) of the Act³. This harmful impact would also be contrary to Policy SP18 of the SCS, which seeks to conserve heritage assets and safeguard the historic environment and the setting of areas of acknowledged importance. The proposal would also conflict with paragraph 196 of the Framework insofar as it seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Other Matters

25. The appellant has raised concerns in relation to the credentials of the officers involved in assessing the application. However, those are procedural matters that do not affect the planning merits of the case, which I have assessed on the basis of the evidence before me.
26. Whilst I note the appellant's examples of decisions where the Council have assessed that the proposed developments did not affect the setting of the listed building, these were for different proposals to that considered as part of the appeal. I have set out above how the appeal proposal would affect the setting of the listed building and I have assessed this appeal on its own merits.

Conclusion

27. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Martinson

INSPECTOR

³ Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990