



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 10 March 2026

by M J Francis BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIfA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th April 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/U2750/W/25/3367431

Green Royd, Studley Road, Ripon, North Yorkshire HG4 2QJ

- 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 Caygill against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is HGTZC24/02887/FUL.
 - The development proposed is partial demolition of existing extensions, erection of single storey extension to house, internal alterations to house, installation of new roof to house, installation of new windows to house, extension and alterations to detached garage, installation of gates, with associated external works.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/U2750/Y/25/3367456

Green Royd, Studley Road, Ripon, North Yorkshire HG4 2QJ

- 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 Caygill against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is HGTZC24/02888/LB.
 - The development proposed is partial demolition of existing extensions, erection of single storey extension to house, internal alterations to house, installation of new roof to house, installation of new windows to house, extension and alterations to detached garage, installation of gates, with associated external works.
-

Decision

1. Appeals A and B are dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for an award of costs has been made by Mr Caygill which is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. Both the main parties have highlighted the discrepancies with the proposed drawings for the coach house. Although the appellant has confirmed the height of the proposal, this does not affect my decision on the appeal.
4. As set out above, there are two appeals on this site, one for planning permission, and the other for listed building consent. Planning permission and listed building consent are under different legislation; however, I have dealt with both appeals together in my reasoning.
5. The proposal relates to a listed building in a conservation area. Therefore, as required by sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special

architectural or historic interest which it possesses, and paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve the listed building, or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Reasons

Significance and special interest

7. Green Royd is a grade II listed building¹ appearing to be of early 19th century date but likely constructed as a farmhouse in the late 17th or early 18th century. Its special interest and significance, in relation to this appeal, derive from its historic and architectural interest. Its symmetrical, brick-built frontage, although altered by a large bay window, flanked by walls with parapets, creates an attractive and imposing classical frontage. This is enhanced by its elevated position, sweeping driveway, and extensive landscaped grounds.
8. Internally, despite some limited alterations, its Georgian plan form remains relatively intact, although some features have been lost. However, it represents a fine example of a lesser gentry house of that period. Next to the house is a large, painted, brick and stone, coach house, which is curtilage listed, plus ancillary buildings. These highlight the functions and status of the house when it was altered in the 19th century.

Effect of the works

9. Between the rear wall of the house and the boundary wall is a narrow yard. It is proposed to infill this with an extension incorporating the existing utility room. Although the rear wall shows evidence of change, it is likely to represent the original extent of the house. While the rear of the building requires maintenance and repair, including treating any damp, there is no compelling evidence as to how the proposed extension would protect the original fabric of the house or how the construction would interact with the boundary wall.
10. The proposed works would extend the house in a non-traditional way with a single storey mono-pitched roof along the rear. This would be attached to a widened side extension which squares off the existing later pantry addition on the eastern elevation. It is acknowledged that the former Georgian plan form of the kitchen and rear service rooms has been altered. However, these later additions are relatively small-scale, and for specific functions. Whilst the extension would create a larger kitchen, it would not recreate, as the appellants contend, the Georgian kitchen space. Instead, the proposed extensions would wrap around the rear and side of the building, with a large roof expanse. This would overwhelm the still legible, existing plan form of the ground floor of the house.
11. On the ground floor, as well as removing a significant part of the existing eastern elevation, a large proportion of the wall between the kitchen and the boot room would be removed, extending the living space into this wing. These internal

¹ List entry number: 1315487

alterations, in addition to the proposed roof structure, would subsume the eastern wing. This would internally harm the existing symmetry, form, and internal layout of the existing wings, which are an important feature of the composition of the house plan.

12. Whilst the back stairwell from the utility area to the first floor may not be an early staircase, it demonstrates the evolution and social history of the house. There is limited substantive evidence of the need to remove this and install a new staircase from the first to second floors. Moreover, there is no structural report, or any details of the design and installation of the new staircase.
13. The proposed subdivision of the first-floor bedroom by the installation of a closet and en-suite, which would alter the original layout of the room, is not supported with any detailed drawings, including the proposed door, or how any walls would be fixed within the room.
14. Although the appellant's proposals seek to retain the Georgian features on the front elevation, the evidential value also stems from its layout, even though some of this is a result of later alterations. Reference is made to the regular and well-proportioned rooms of the Georgian layout. However, the changes proposed to the ground floor and the subdivision of rooms on the 1st floor, would harm the legibility of the Georgian house and its significance.
15. The proposal includes work to the roof and the replacement of tiles with Welsh slate. However, there is no assessment of the current condition of the roof and its structure, or a method statement of how the works would be undertaken. Likewise, there is no evidence of the condition of the eaves level cornice and lead, or any details and specification of what is proposed.
16. New windows are proposed and although the appellant states that they would accept a condition, I have not been provided with a window schedule or condition survey. Indeed, from what I saw, the windows on the front elevation did not appear to be in poor condition. Most windows had sash cords, and although painting and maintenance is required, there is no compelling evidence before me, that they need to be replaced. Furthermore, there are no details provided of features such as the wooden sliding shutters I saw in first-floor rooms at the front, and how or whether these are proposed to be retained if new windows were installed.
17. I saw the large, arched window that lights the stairwell. This had modern secondary glazing whose current design and fitting does not allow for the cleaning of the window. Whilst new secondary glazing could be appropriate in this location, there is limited substantive evidence of any details or drawing of this and how it would be fitted.
18. The existing coach house is a rectangular building of mainly stone construction, with brick infill, and a slate roof, hipped on the side elevations. It is subdivided into garage space and workshops with an internal staircase to a loft area. There are two matching doors on the front, which although in a deteriorating condition, would appear to be of historic interest. The garage doors are likely of a later date.
19. The proposal seeks to build a large, roughly rectangular extension attached to the eastern elevation of the existing building with an internal stair. On the western elevation of the extension, there would be glazed doors at the junction with the original building, and three garage doors.

20. The extension would have a larger footprint than the existing, sizeable coach house. A hipped roof to the front would visibly appear at odds compared to the existing outer facing pitched roofs of the coach house and house. Whilst the differing roof forms would reduce the massing of the extension, they appear awkward and contrived, compared to the simplicity and design of the existing functional coach house.
21. Additionally, the new wing to the coach house would extend beyond the building line of the front elevation of the house. Whilst landscaping within the site would ameliorate the visual effect of this to a limited extent, an extension of this size and shape, would appear obtrusive. Currently, the coach house is seen as an ancillary feature, but this would give it added dominance, reducing the primacy of the listed house and causing harm to its setting.
22. I saw that stone finials were sited on one side of the flank wall only. The plans show that the two existing ones would be restored, and four others would be reinstated. However, there is no evidence as to whether these would be replicas, or whether the originals survive.
23. A drawing shows a proposed gate and pillars which would be installed at two locations on the site. However, there are no details of the materials. Additionally, there are no details, including the height, of the new dry stone boundary wall. Therefore, I have no compelling evidence as to whether the proposed gates and boundary walls would be appropriate.
24. Given the above, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the listed building and its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. This would harm the significance of the designated heritage asset. Consequently, I give this harm considerable importance and weight in the planning balance of these appeals.

Other Matters

25. The site is within the Ripon Conservation Area (CA). The significance of the CA, insofar as it relates to this appeal, is that it covers the development of the city from the Anglo-Saxon period through to its expansion in the Victorian era. Dominated by the cathedral, the city has a rich architectural and archaeological history. Whilst Green Royd occupies only a small part of the CA, it is a prominent and fine building. The proposal, particularly the large forward projection proposed for the coach house, would cause a small degree of harm to the CA by the erosion of historic and architectural detail of the buildings. This would harm and thus fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA in conflict with section 72(1) of the Act.

Public Benefits and Balance

26. Paragraph 212 of the Framework advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets and that any such harm should have clear and convincing justification. I find the harm to the listed building to be less than substantial, and whilst this is moderate in scale, it is, nevertheless, of considerable importance and weight.

27. Where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. The appellant has set out that the works would repair the building, adapting it to a modern use. They consider that the proposed rear extension would protect the rear walls and reinstate some of the original proportions of the Georgian kitchen. Additionally, the works would remove materials that are damaging the building, and that thermal improvements, including secondary glazing, would reduce energy use.
28. The Planning Practice Guidance² sets out what may be regarded as public benefits, such as works to a listed private dwelling which secures its future as a designated heritage asset. Whilst there would be some economic benefits from the proposed works, the building is already a private house and therefore has an optimum viable use as a dwelling. Moreover, whilst some of the works may benefit the building fabric, there is limited substantive evidence of these to justify the proposed changes to the listed building. Furthermore, by extending the existing kitchen area, it would fail to reinstate the original proportions of the kitchen. Whilst I give significant weight to the need to support energy efficiency, there is limited substantive evidence as to what is proposed to achieve this.
29. Therefore, the proposed works are essentially a private benefit which would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified. In the absence of any defined public benefit, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the listed building and its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
30. Consequently, I consider that the proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and paragraph 212 of the Framework. Additionally, it would conflict with policies HP2 and HP3 of the Harrogate District Local Plan, 2014-2035, 2020, which collectively requires that proposals affecting a heritage asset or its setting, protect or enhance those features which contribute to its special architectural or historic interest, as well as the distinctive characteristics of the area.

Conclusion

31. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the proposal would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building, contrary to the Act and the Framework. Furthermore, the proposal would not be in accordance with the development plan.
32. I therefore conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

M J Francis

INSPECTOR

² Paragraph: 020 Reference ID: 18a-020-20190723, 23 July 2019