

17/717

**Wendy Strangeway**

**From:** Building  
**Sent:** 07 November 2018 17:40  
**To:** Planning; Ailsa Teasdale  
**Subject:** 10 South End, Osmotherley - Amended Plans



The amended plans are not considered to substantively address the concerns raised by the Conservation Architect with regard to the original proposals and therefore our objection to the application remains. Section 62 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Section 72 of the Act requires that when determining planning applications within a conservation area, the local planning authority shall pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of that area.

The proposed scheme would seriously harm the character of the building as one of special architectural and historic interest as a consequence of the erosion of the legibility of the historic relationship between the principal host building and its subservient ancillary buildings; through the loss of the relative scale of the house and outbuildings as a result of the raising of the roof heights of the outbuildings and their remodelling as wider and deeper structures than the main house; the creation of additional openings and the domestic design of the fenestration; and loss of the historic pig sties, all of which result in the creation of a residential unit which not only is larger than the host property but is devoid of the majority of features which contribute to the distinctive character of these buildings as former ancillary agricultural buildings. Furthermore, the plans contain insufficient detail regarding the internal alterations and the impact the proposed alterations would have on the historic fabric and features of these buildings as they lack any information as how historic floor and wall surfaces and residual historic features would be preserved and incorporated. The loss of the historic scale, distinctive form and arrangement and agricultural characteristics would also harm the character and appearance of the Osmotherley Conservation Area (also a designated heritage asset). There is no clear and convincing justification for the harm identified to these heritage assets that would result from the proposed scheme and the current scheme would not constitute a public benefit that would outweigh any harm because it would substantially erode the heritage value of the listed building.

As such, it is considered that the application fails to comply with the relevant policies of the NPPF, namely:

Para.193 "When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation".

Para.194 "Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification".

Para. 195 "Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss."

The NPPF Planning Practice Guide advises in relation to "optimal viable use" that If there is only one viable use, that use is the optimum viable use. If there is a range of alternative viable uses, the optimum use is the one likely to cause the least harm to the significance of the asset, not just through necessary initial changes, but also as a result of subsequent wear and tear and likely future changes. The optimum viable use may not necessarily be the most profitable one. It might be the original use, but that may no longer be economically viable or even the most compatible with the long-term conservation of the asset . However, if from a conservation point of view there is no real difference between viable uses, then the choice of use is a decision for the owner. In this case, the buildings are in a poor state of repair and largely disused, and some investment is necessary to preserve them. Whilst the optimum use would be their repair and

retention as outbuildings, they may be considered excessive in extent for most domestic uses given the village location. As such, it is accepted that some form of domestic conversion may be justified, but that conversion to a substantial separate dwelling is likely to be excessive and incompatible with preserving the heritage value of the listed building. Any scheme for repairing and reusing the buildings should seek to retain their current form and envelope, preserving the features and characteristics which contribute to their significance and minimising alterations. I would suggest that partial conversion is likely to be more appropriate, retaining a garage to the ground floor as existing and adding accommodation to the first floor and the former byre. The pig sties would preferably be retained for storage, although may be capable of conversion subject to a sensitive scheme. The reduced accommodation that would result is likely to be more appropriate as additional to the main house for local or holiday letting or annexe use rather than for permanent separation in order to be compatible with the reduced scale of accommodation, retain the garage for use with the house and avoid subdivision of the historic curtilage.