



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 31 March 2026

by **M J Francis BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIfA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 April 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/U2750/W/25/3371738

Plompton Hall Farmhouse, Plompton, North Yorkshire HG5 8NA

- 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 and Mrs Isaacs against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
- The application Ref is HGTZC25/01060/FUL.
- The works proposed are rear extension and internal reconfiguration including insertion of 1no. external door.

Appeal B Ref: APP/U2750/Y/25/3371743

Plompton Hall Farmhouse, Plompton, North Yorkshire HG5 8NA

- 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 and Mrs Isaacs against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
- The application Ref is HGTZC25/01061/LB.
- The works proposed are rear extension and internal reconfiguration including insertion of 1no. external door.

Decision

1. Appeals A and B are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The address on the application form includes 'Farrar Wood to Plompton Park', however, as this is not an official part of the address, I have omitted it from the banner heading above.
3. 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.
4. Although the reasons for refusal do not refer to the garden wall, the appeal site consists of the grade II listed Plompton Hall Farmhouse¹ (hereafter the farmhouse), and the grade II listed wall between Plompton Hall stables and farmhouse² (hereafter the listed wall) which surrounds part of the garden and would be partly hidden by the proposed extension.
5. The proposal relates to listed buildings within 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

¹ List Entry Number: 1149838

² List Entry Number: 1191441

the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

6. The appellants have stated³ that they would omit from the proposals the stud partition in the utility room, the fully glazed door on the northern elevation and the rooflights and flue on the proposed extension. There are no revised plans that show these changes, and so for the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal based on the drawings on which the Council made its decision.
7. The site is in the Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless it accords with one of the exceptions, which includes in paragraph 154 c), the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. This is not a disputed issue. As I agree that it would accord with paragraph 154 c) and not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, I will not consider this further.

Main Issues

8. Therefore, the main issues are:
 - whether the proposal would preserve the grade II listed buildings, or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess; and
 - whether it would preserve or enhance the Plompton Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

Significance and special interest

9. The special interest and significance of the farmhouse, insofar as it relates to this appeal, derives from its historic and architectural interest. It is likely to have been designed in c.1760 by John Carr, for Daniel Lascelles, who purchased the estate in 1755. The farmhouse is part of a complex of buildings consisting of the Hall, stables and farmstead, within a designed landscape, also by John Carr. Its association with this notable Yorkshire architect adds to the historical value of the site.
10. Although previously connected to a line of buildings to the north, the farmhouse now stands alone, allowing the symmetry and detailing of the building to be appreciated. Built in a classic Palladian design, it has a central portico with a pyramidal roof, and wings either side with hipped roofs. The design and the oculi located in the recessed segmental arches in each bay, contribute to its aesthetic value. Built in coursed sandstone and ashlar with a stone slate roof, sash windows and a Diocletian window facing the garden, it is an imposing building with a visually pleasing design in a country house style. Internally, it had extensive alterations in the 1980s, prior to being listed.
11. The southern elevation overlooks a large garden area with a lawn and trees. This is defined by the high listed wall with stone coping which runs along the western and southern boundary, linking the stables and farmhouse, and built in the same

³ Letter of 15 May, 2025, Appendix 2

stone as the farmhouse. At the junction between the wall and the single storey building, is a stone pier with a cornice and ball finial. Next to this is a wooden plank door providing access into the walled garden. The significance of the listed wall, insofar as it relates to this appeal, is that it is part of the original design, built at the same time of the farmhouse. Moreover, it creates a private, verdant garden, separating the property from the rest of the estate. With its sense of enclosure, it enhances the setting of the farmhouse.

12. The garden is also defined by the rear of the grade II* listed stables⁴ (the stables), and on the eastern side by a low stone boundary wall which divides up the garden of the farmhouse.

Effect of proposed works on the listed buildings

13. The eastern elevation has several blind openings, one of which would be utilised for a new door opening to provide access into a newly created utility room. Whilst the insertion of the doorway would re-use this opening, details of the door and its fittings are not before me. The proposed utility room and insertion of a toilet, would, however, subdivide the room and alter its proportions. However, removing the existing toilet from the space currently occupied by the dining room would be beneficial.
14. Although it has been confirmed that plumbing for the utility room would be located under floors or utilise the water supply from an upstairs bathroom, there are no drawings showing the location of pipework and how it would affect the fabric of the listed building. Likewise, while there is no dispute about moving the kitchen to the front of the house, there are no details of how services would be connected and located within the room. Whilst the appellants suggest that the installation of services could be conditioned, citing an appeal at Keeling House, a grade II* listed building, I am unaware of the full circumstances of that case.
15. The existing wall that subdivides the hallway from the dining room is proposed to be replaced by a glazed screen with double doors. The evidence suggests that this is a later wall, and a previous planning application shows that it used to contain two windows. Although removing it and opening this space may return the building to a possible former layout, there are no drawings or details of the proposed doors and their suitability for the listed building.
16. The main parties disagree as to whether the single storey building, now used as a utility room, is original to the building. Whatever its history, there is evidence on the western wall of the house of other structures that have previously been constructed next to it. Notwithstanding this, the proposal to fully glaze the existing door on the northern elevation would be inappropriate. As one of the first elevations to be seen when entering the grounds of the property, a glazed doorway in contrast to the historic openings and windows on the other elevations, would appear discordant.
17. The proposed rear extension would repurpose the utility room with a recessed, glazed link connecting it to the proposed single storey garden room. This has been designed to sit below the listed wall, with the materials described as a lightweight, 'crisp-detailed' timber. The appellants refer to it being in line with ground floor windows and below the drip mould and creating a clear distinction between the

⁴ List Entry Number: 1191416 stables to Plompton Hall

listed house and wall and the proposed extension. However, there is only limited substantive evidence of this structure, with no large-scale drawings and sections.

18. Although it has been conceived so that the design of the farmhouse remains legible and the most dominant part, the proposed extension, even if sited to one side, would disrupt this. It is acknowledged that the southern elevation has seen changes including the insertion of the bay window and the door next to the Diocletian window. However, despite this, the symmetry of the farmhouse is key to how the building was designed and constructed, and this remains legible. Attaching an extension on one side, even if considered to be lightweight in form, would disrupt this and be harmful.
19. Moreover, it would result in a lengthy building attached to a part of the farmhouse where previously there has been no extension, causing a significant projection into the garden. Although separated from the farmhouse by the proposed link, it would visually overlap and obscure part of the southern elevation and how it is experienced.
20. Although there may not be a loss of historic fabric and the extension would be built parallel to the listed wall, it would hide the garden gate, even if refurbished and still visible from outside the property. Furthermore, it would obscure a significant length of the listed wall, with the flue and skylights in the extension being visible above the wall. The private garden space created behind the high listed wall, whilst not visible from outside the property, has an important association with the farmhouse and strongly contributes to the setting of the building from the south and its overall significance. Therefore, the proposed extension would interrupt the legibility between the house and the listed wall.
21. Given the above, I find that the proposal would fail to preserve the listed buildings and their setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. This would harm the significance of the designated heritage assets. Consequently, I give this harm considerable importance and weight in the planning balance of these appeals.

Effect of proposed works on the CA

22. The CA includes the Plompton Rocks registered park and garden (RPG) and surrounding historic parkland. The characteristics are a picturesque landscape of rocky outcrops, a lake and woodland which formed the 18th century pleasure grounds. This is complemented by the buildings within the Plompton Hall estate and Plompton Square, a group of farm cottages for estate workers. The significance of the CA insofar as it relates to this appeal is that the farmhouse is an integral part of the estate and the pleasure grounds that surround it, all reputedly designed by John Carr.
23. The appellants contend that the rear garden of the farmhouse does not make a positive contribution to the significance of the CA. However, surrounded by a listed wall and other listed buildings, it provides a verdant private garden within the Plompton Hall estate. Although a small part of the overall CA, I have found that the works would harm the listed house through the erosion of its historic and architectural significance, therefore, I also find that the proposal would result in some very limited harm to the CA. Consequently, it would not preserve the character or appearance of the CA.

Other Matters

24. I have had due regard to the other heritage assets within and around the site. The stables which adjoin the farmhouse, have been converted to residential use. To the south of this is Plompton Hall and flanking walls, listed grade II*⁵, thought to have been converted from the southern range of the stables. The significance of both these buildings, insofar as they relate to this case, is that they are part of the complex of buildings designed for the estate by John Carr for Daniel Lascelles, and as such have great architectural and historic interest.
25. To the north of the farmhouse are the grade II listed cart shed⁶, barn and outbuildings⁷. In relation to this appeal, the interest and significance of these buildings is that they represent a typical mid to late 18th century farmyard layout, likely built as part of the planned farmstead by John Carr for Daniel Lascelles.
26. Plompton Rocks is a grade II* RPG⁸ which consists of mid-18th century pleasure grounds within the remains of a park held by the Plompton family from the 11th century until 1749. The pleasure grounds, laid out with advice from John Carr, would have incorporated the mansion originally commissioned by Daniel Lascelles. The site is based around the outcrops of millstone grit and the lake and was planted with trees and shrubs. Some of the parkland is retained within the RPG, in addition to the brick walled kitchen garden to the east of the Hall and stables. The significance of the RPG, as it relates to this appeal, is that the farmhouse is sited within this extensive designed landscape.
27. I find that the proposal would not harm the setting of these designated heritage assets.
28. The appellants have drawn my attention to the glazed extension on the grade II listed The Old Granary, the orangery on the grade II* listed The Carriage House, and the glazed carriage archway on The Barn. Whilst acknowledging that these additions are on buildings within the estate, I do not have full details of these works and so I cannot be sure of the circumstances of these examples. In any case, I have determined the appeals on their own merits, based on the evidence before me.
29. Other options for constructing a garden room have been discussed by the main parties. However, as these works are not part of the application, I have not considered these options.

Public Benefits and Balance

30. 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 significance of the listed buildings to be less than substantial. However, within this assessment, I find the harm to the farmhouse to be moderate in scale, whilst the harm to the listed wall would be at the lower end of the scale,

⁵ List Entry Number: 1149836

⁶ List Entry Number: 1315644, cart shed approximately 30 metres north of Plompton Hall Farmhouse

⁷ List Entry Number: 1191476

⁸ List Entry Number: 1000535

and the harm to the CA would be very limited. These harms are, however, of considerable importance and weight.

31. 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.
32. The Planning Practice Guidance⁹ 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.
33. The appellants have stated that the proposals would have either a neutral or a negligible beneficial effect on the listed building and have not set out any public benefits. Although the appellants wish to improve the layout of rooms on the ground floor and create a separation between formal and secondary rooms, the proposed works are essentially a private benefit. Therefore, this 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 buildings and their setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Additionally, it would not preserve the character or appearance of the CA.
34. 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, and the distinctive characteristics of the area.

Conclusion

35. 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 buildings, contrary to the Act and the Framework. Furthermore, the proposal would not be in accordance with the development plan.
36. I therefore conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

M J Francis

INSPECTOR

⁹ Paragraph: 020 Reference ID: 18a-020-20190723, 23 July 2019