
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 28 April 2025

by **L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 May 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/U2750/W/24/3355897

Throstle Nest Farm, Manor House Farm and Throstle Nest, Summerbridge, North Yorkshire HG3 4JS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Martin Dalby against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
- The application Ref is ZC24/02487/FUL.
- The development proposed is replacement of glazed side extension with new glazed extension.

Appeal B Ref: APP/U2750/Y/24/3355916

Throstle Nest Farm, Manor House Farm and Throstle Nest, Summerbridge, North Yorkshire HG3 4JS

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Martin Dalby against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZC24/02488/LB.
 - The works proposed are replacement of glazed side extension with new glazed extension.
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

3. Both appeals relate to the same scheme under different but complimentary legislation, I have therefore dealt with them together in my reasoning except where indicated otherwise.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of the grade II listed Throstle Nest and its effect on the Nidderdale National Landscape.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached dwelling known as the grade II listed Throstle Nest (Throstle Nest). It is within a small group of buildings historically associated with agriculture within the Nidderdale National Landscape.

Heritage

6. Throstle Nest is described in the listing description as late C18, early C19. It is two storey and constructed from coursed squared gritstone with a graduated stone slate roof. It's south westerly facing elevation (main front elevation) proudly faces a valley and displays a rich variety of traditional architectural details, particularly a two storey jetted gabled porch with decorative stonework detailing. The windows have stone cills, lintels and mullions and other stonework detailing of a variety of forms. It also has gable copings, moulded kneelers and stone stacks. Insofar as is relevant to these appeals, the significance of Throstle Nest, is founded on its age, traditional architectural detailing, historical association with agriculture and its presence in the rural landscape.
7. It is proposed to replace an existing modern, simple, timber framed and glazed single storey lean-to extension with a larger flat roofed contemporary extension. This would facilitate a new more practical living space which could be used for a variety of domestic purposes which cannot be enjoyed in the existing confined space provided by the existing structure which would be replaced.
8. Subject to sensitive fixings and construction methods, the proposal would not involve the loss of or damage to historic fabric associated with the listed building. Furthermore, any impact on archaeology there may be, could be mitigated through appropriate planning conditions.
9. I acknowledge the proposal is much smaller than a previous scheme considered by the Council. I accept that Throstle Nest has been extended and altered over different stages of its lifetime including the installation of double glazed window units and the creation of enlarged window openings. I also accept the proposed extension would be subservient to the main dwelling and acknowledge the attempt to use high quality traditional materials sympathetic to the heritage asset.
10. However, the proposed extension, with its flat roof and sleek glazed finish would be a proportionately large contemporary addition to the traditional appeal building. It would project significantly beyond the line of the existing structure it would replace and into the space to the side of the appeal building.
11. This would mean it would protrude beyond the side elevation of the appeal property. Even though, I accept any wide ranging views would be screened by existing landscaping, and further landscaping could be installed, it would still be noticeable in the context of the main front elevation, close to the building when walking around it. Furthermore, the proposed extension would become the most dominant feature of the elevation it would be attached to, which displays a variety of traditional architectural features which would become less prominent as the contemporary extension draws the eye.
12. Thus, through its scale, form and finish, the proposed modern contemporary extension would conflict with and draw attention away from the traditional architectural features of the listed building. This would harm the significance of Throstle Nest and fail to preserve its special architectural and historic interest.
13. The harm to the listed building would be less than substantial and towards the lower end of any range. However, it is still of considerable importance and weight. In these circumstances, the National Planning Policy Framework (the

Framework) states that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme. I will return to this below in my balance.

National Landscape

14. Insofar as is relevant to these appeals, the Nidderdale National Landscape is characterised by upland moors and valleys, with traditional agricultural farmsteads and villages. National landscapes are designated for the purposes of conserving and enhancing their natural beauty.
15. In my view, because the impact of the proposals are limited to within close proximity to the appeal dwelling and would not be widely visible in the landscape, the effect of the proposals on those purposes would be neutral and the natural beauty of the Nidderdale National Landscape would be preserved.

Planning and Heritage Balance

16. The existing lean-to which would be demolished is modest and sympathetic, its demolition therefore carries neutral weight in the balance. The effect on the Nidderdale National Landscape also carries neutral weight.
17. The proposals would improve the living conditions for the occupiers in terms of additional internal and improved living space. However, with the absence of detailed evidence to the contrary, these are personal benefits and not public.
18. I acknowledge the economic benefits of construction. I also observed some signs of water affecting the stonework inside the existing lean-to which could be mitigated by the scheme which would be a benefit. However, overall, any public benefits there may be, are clearly modest and would be insufficient to outweigh the great weight I must attach to the harm I have identified to the designated heritage asset.
19. For these reasons the scheme would harm the special architectural and historic interest of the grade II listed Throstle Nest. Thus, the scheme conflicts with paragraphs 212 and 215 of the Framework. It also fails to accord with Policy HP2 and HP3 of the Harrogate District Local Plan (2020), which taken together seek to avoid harm to the character and appearance of an area and heritage assets.

Other Matters

20. In reaching these conclusions I have noted the comments with regard to the Council's handling of the proposals. I also note that the appeal property is in good order which in part is due to it being carefully maintained.
21. I have also considered the details of the existing public right of way and the proposed footpath diversion plan. However, the proposed diversion route is not a matter before me in determining these appeals under the legislation detailed above. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for the reasons given above, I have not needed to consider the matter any further.
22. For the avoidance of any doubt, I confirm I have had regard only to the planning and heritage merits of the case, and none of these other matters are sufficient to outweigh my earlier findings.

Conclusion

23. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR