
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 April 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/Y/25/3363686

Manor Farm Main Road, Nawton, York YO62 7RD

- 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 Steven Wood against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZE24/015133/LBC.
 - The works proposed are Internal and external alterations to include the formation of a ground floor bathroom, formation of 2no. window openings and 1no. double door opening to rear elevation, removal of internal partition walls and existing cupboard, roofing works to western addition, removal of cement/gravel harling to north and western elevations of side addition and reinstatement of historic apertures.
-

Decisions

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of the grade II listed Manor Farmhouse.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey dwelling with an attached single storey barn or store (the store) known as the grade II listed Manor Farmhouse (Manor Farmhouse).

Significance

4. Manor Farmhouse is of C18 origin, constructed from coursed dressed sandstone (on its elevation facing the road) and rubble. It has a pantile roof with brick stacks and a variety of high quality traditional internal and external architectural features. These include a central staircase, sash windows, coped gables with kneelers, raised quoins and a first floor brick band. Insofar as is relevant to this appeal, the significance of the listed building is founded on its age, its traditional architectural detailing, the use of traditional materials and methods in its construction and its historical association with agriculture as a farmhouse within a rural settlement.

Effect on significance

5. Two window openings and a pair of French doors would be installed in the rear elevation together with new stone lintels. I accept that those new openings would be required to serve the proposed internal layout and seek to ensure acceptable living conditions. I also accept the sizes and positioning of the

existing openings in the rear elevation are varied. However, whilst the proposed windows would be relatively small and of limited prominence compared to the other openings having a neutral impact on the listed building, the French doors would be much larger with a highly modern domestic appearance. In my view, the proposed French doors would become the most noticeable of all openings in the relevant elevation of the traditional farmhouse. Thus, the French doors would detract from the traditional architectural features and agricultural character of the listed building, thus harming its significance.

6. A section of internal brick wall would be removed which currently separates the dining room and lounge from a narrow space which more likely than not has been historically used for storage. The proposed layout alteration would create the space for a new pantry area, toilet and shower room and increase the size of the lounge with much of the separating wall remaining in place, such that the original plan form would remain legible. Whilst the lounge would be deeper than the dining room and would incorporate an area behind the stairs to give it an I-shape, the space would not be odd or impractical and the additional space in the lounge would not appear noticeably uncharacteristic of the listed building. Indeed, the proposal would retain a central staircase with two large reception rooms either side of it. Thus, in my view the changes proposed to the ground floor layout would not harm the significance of the listed building. Nevertheless, the loss of historic fabric associated with the removal of the masonry would harm the significance of the asset.
7. The proposal would also involve the removal and reinstallation of a timber panelled doored corner cupboard in the kitchen area. This appears to retain hand forged ironmongery and appears to be an early, if not original feature of the listed building with some of its original fittings intact. It would have been used by early if not the original occupants. Without a detailed method statement for the proposed work relating to this cupboard, particularly, detailing its method of removal, refurbishment and reinstallation, I find the proposed works to it would involve damage to historic fabric which would harm the significance of the heritage asset.
8. The proposed roof works to the store would involve alterations to the roof described as the reasonable minimum necessary for safety. The works would include the installation of a new roof structure including new timber wall plates, where there are currently none in situ. I acknowledge the comments that the existing structure, particularly the timbers of the roof are beyond practicable repair due to the extent of rot and wood worm. I also accept the appellant's suggestion that the replacement structure would be designed and installed in a manner complementary to and closely resembling the historic structure. However, some components of the roof structure are clearly of some age if not significant components of the original listed building's roof composition. Whilst I observed some obvious damage and deterioration, there is no substantive evidence which suggests the roof structure or any individual components of it are beyond viable economic repair.
9. In my view, the proposed works to the roof would clearly involve the loss of and damage to significant and structural historic fabric associated with the listed building. It is without doubt that irrespective of the quality of the construction, the proposals, particularly the replacement of original roof timbers with new timbers, rather than repair where practicable would clearly

harm the significance of the heritage asset and should be avoided if at all possible.

10. In reaching these conclusions, whilst there is some evidence to support the proposals, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is clear in paragraph 207 that developers should describe the significance of a heritage asset and that level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As this proposal involves major work to a roof structure of a listed building, the evidence is insufficient to justify the loss of the relevant historic fabric which is irreplaceable once lost. On the basis of the evidence I am unable to conclude definitively that the existing roof structure is unsafe or that the works proposed are the only viable way in which it could be made safe.
11. Thus, with regard to the roof works and the cupboard, I must take a precautionary approach and find both elements harmful. Overall, on the basis of the evidence before me, the combined harm to the listed building, I have described above 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 Framework states that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme, which includes securing the asset's optimum viable use.

Planning and Heritage Balance

12. The removal of the render to the store and the refurbishment of the traditional stonework would be a heritage benefit positively enhancing the appearance of the heritage asset in a way in which better communicates its significance irrespective of whether any hidden historical openings are exposed or not. The roof works would address signs of structural instability, which is also a benefit. The proposals would also improve the living conditions for the occupiers in terms of improved access and additional internal and improved living space. I also acknowledge the economic benefits of construction. However, overall, any public benefits there may be, are clearly modest and their combined weight would, in my view be insufficient to outweigh the great weight I attach to the combined harm I have identified to the designated heritage asset arising from the harmful works I have identified above.
13. For these reasons the scheme would harm the special architectural and historic interest of the grade II listed Manor Farmhouse. Thus, the scheme conflicts with paragraphs 212 and 215 of the Framework and fails to accord with Policy SP12 of the Rydale Plan – Local Plan Strategy (2013), which taken together seek to avoid harm to heritage assets, where that harm is not outweighed by public benefits.

Other Matters

14. 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 has been maintained by appellant and this has been challenging. I have also considered the numerous examples of other listed building works/development proposals detailed in the evidence, however, my findings relate to the specific details of the work proposed in this case and cannot be directly comparable. 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

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

L Fleming

INSPECTOR