

8. LISTED BUILDING APPLICATION – ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION TO OLD HALL, CREAMERY LANE, PARWICH (NP/DDD/0626/0579), LB)

APPLICANT: MR AND MRS HARVEY & WATSON

Summary

1. The application site is a Grade II listed dwelling located in Parwich.
2. Listed Building consent is sought for a single storey lean-to extension that would infill the north east corner of the building. A new door opening is proposed in the existing external north east wall serving the kitchen. Plans also show the existing boiler would be replaced and enclosed by a new boiler cupboard.
3. The proposed extension and alterations would harm the significance of the grade II listed building.
4. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Site and Surroundings

5. Old Hall is a Grade II listed building located within the northern area of Parwich and its Conservation Area (CA).
6. The three-storey dwelling, dates mid-17th century, (but was restored in 1925 when the stairwell extension was added), comprises of two ranges constructed from coursed rubble limestone with sandstone dressings under a plain and fish scale tiled roof with stone coped gabled, moulded kneelers and ball finials.
7. The dwelling sits within a large curtilage in an elevated position overlooking Parwich. Outbuildings are located immediately to the north. Creamery Lane and access bounds the curtilage to the south west.
8. The nearest neighbouring property is Barn Cottage located 20 metres to the north.

Proposal

9. The application is for a single story predominantly glazed rear extension to the Grade II dwelling known as 'Old Hall'. The base of the glazed extension would consist of random coursed stone while the doors and windows would have slimline metal frames. Metal cladding would join the extension to the existing building. A new opening in the existing rear elevation would be created to allow access into the proposed extension; this new opening would result in the loss of some original stonework, an original stone window and an adjacent window dating to 1925.
10. Internally, within the existing kitchen a pantry is to be rebuilt to house a new boiler.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. **By virtue of the poor incongruous design, inappropriate scale and massing, and harm to and loss of historic fabric the development would fail to conserve the significance of the listed building and its setting and the arising harm would not be outweighed by public benefits, contrary to Core Strategy policy L3, Development Management policies DMC5 and DMC7 and the NPPF.**

Key Issues

11. The impact of the proposed works upon the significance of the Grade II listed building and its setting.

History

12. 2026 – NP/DDD/0126/0013 – Rear / side extension and internal alterations. New Glasshouse. Application refused as the proposal failed to demonstrate conservation of the significance of the heritage asset, or that any harm would be outweighed by public benefit.
13. 2026 – NP/DDD/0126/0014 – Listed Building consent – rear / side extension and internal alterations. New Glasshouse. Application refused as the proposal failed to demonstrate that the development could conserve the significance of the heritage asset, or that any harm would be outweighed by public benefits, contrary to policy.
14. 2025 – NP/DDD/0125/0058 – Listed Building consent – rear / side extension and internal alterations. New Glasshouse. Application withdrawn based on officer advice that insufficient heritage information was submitted to fully assess the proposals.
15. 2023 – NP/DDD/0723/0831 – Listed Building consent – replacement rear / side extension, 1925 stairwell extension, internal alterations and standalone garden room. Application withdrawn as officers advised insufficient information to fully assess the proposal as a detailed heritage statement is required.
16. 2023 – NP/DDD/0723/0829 – Planning permission – replacement rear / side extension, 1952 stairwell extension, internal alterations and standalone garden room. Application withdrawn as officers advised insufficient information to fully assess the proposals as a detailed heritage statement is required.

Consultations

17. Parwich Parish Council: Support – *‘provides natural light to areas of the house while respecting its historic character. The applicant has provided a comprehensive heritage statement. The original stone building will remain visible. The extension has been redesigned to be smaller and lighter and subordinate to the historic house. Previous concerns look to have been carefully considered’.*
18. PDNPA Built Environment Officer: *‘The proposal is essentially the same as the last time, but with a glass roof, which would not cover the roof of the outshot. The heritage statement has been updated to reflect my previous comments and seems to agree with them regarding the phasing of the building. I continue to assess that the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the building. The massing of the extension would come to dominate and obscure much of the rear of the building, whilst the reflectivity of the glass would obscure most of the interior and clash with the solidity of the rest of the building. I understand the application argues that the rear of the building would remain visible through the glass, but in practice this is rarely the case. Additionally, the new opening to gain access to the room would require the removal of historic fabric, including what is likely to be an original window opening. The application argues that some loss of significance is acceptable in order to safeguard the continued use of the building. However, I have no doubt that the future of the building is already secure, so this cannot be given any weight’.*

Representations

19. During the consultation period the Authority has not received any letters of representation for this listed building application.

Main Policies

- 20. Relevant Core Strategy policies: L3
- 21. Relevant Development Management Plan policies: DMC5 and DMC7

Statutory Framework

- 22. Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that special regard must be had to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings.
- 23. National Park designation is the highest level of landscape designation in the UK. The Environment Act 1995 sets out two statutory purposes for National Parks in England: to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage and promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of National Parks by the public. When they carry out these purposes, they also have the duty to; seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities in National Parks.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 24. The NPPF is a material consideration and carries particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. Paragraph 189 states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.
- 25. In the National Park, the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy (2011) and the Development Management Policies (DMP) (2019). The development plan provides a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. In this case, it is considered there are no significant conflicts between prevailing policies in the development plan and the NPPF.
- 26. Paragraph 207 of the NPPF states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. It notes that the 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. It advises that as a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary.
- 27. Paragraph 208 states that local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
- 28. Paragraph 212 states that 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 (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
- 29. Paragraph 213 states that 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. Substantial harm to or loss of Grade II listed buildings should be exceptional.

30. Paragraph 214 states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm (or total loss of significance of) a heritage asset consent should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or that all of the following apply:
- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
 - b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
 - c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
 - d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.
31. Paragraph 215 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance

Conversion of Historic Buildings SPD
Building Design Guide
Alterations & Extensions SPD

Assessment

The impact of the development upon the significance of the listed building and its setting

32. The application seeks listed building consent for a single storey extension and internal alterations to the grade II dwelling, Old Hall.
33. Old Hall is a substantial three storey grade II dwelling positioned in a large curtilage in a prominent elevated position on Creamery Lane within the northern area of Parwich and its Conservation Area. The list description dates the house to the mid-17th century, but restored in 1925.
34. Submitted plans propose a lean-to extension located within the north east corner of the dwelling to provide a garden room. The extension would wrap around an existing single storey extension, which houses an internal staircase, and form an 'L' shaped floor plan, infilling the external space.
35. The extension would have a metal frame construction, housing a glazed roof alongside almost fully glazed elevations, sat on a random coursed stone dwarf wall. The roof would project under the eaves of the main dwelling and the staircase extension.
36. Slimline metal doors and windows would be provided alongside an area of powder coated flat metal cladding on the north elevation. The doors and windows are divided into groups of three-square glazing panels. The existing extension would project above the roof of the proposed extension.
37. Plans also propose a new opening in the external existing north east elevation which serves to kitchen to allow a new access to the proposed garden room.
38. Internally, within the existing kitchen a pantry is to be rebuilt to house a new boiler.
39. In assessing the proposal relevant policies in the development plan and the NPPF make it clear the Authority must have special regard to the desirability of conserving the

heritage asset, and its setting, as well as the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

40. The Authority's Local Development Framework policy L3 sets out that cultural heritage assets of architectural or historic significance must be conserved and where appropriate enhanced. Other than in exceptional circumstances development will not be permitted where it is likely to cause harm to significance of cultural heritage assets.
41. In particular, Development Management Policy DMC7 addresses development affecting listed buildings, advising that applications for such development should be determined in accordance with policy DMC5 and should address how their significance, character and appearance will be conserved, and why the proposed development and related works are desirable or necessary. It makes clear that if applicants fail to provide adequate or accurate detailed information to show the effect of the development on the significance of the heritage asset and its setting, the application will be refused.
42. Part B of DMC7 also states that development will not be permitted if it would directly, indirectly or cumulatively lead to: the removal of original walls; removal, alteration or if the application fails to provide adequate or accurate detailed information to show the effect on the significance of the listed building.
43. DMC5 also requires detailed advice relating to proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, requiring new development to demonstrate how valued features will be conserved, as well as detailing the types and levels of information required to support such proposals. L3 of the core strategy reiterates this.
44. Further, chapter 16 of the NPPF requires local planning authorities to put great weight on the conservation of designated heritage assets; the greater their significance, the greater the weight.
45. Both the NPPF and the PDNPA's local policies state that if a development were to cause less than substantial harm the application should be refused unless the harm is outweighed by the public benefits arising from the proposals, if any.
46. This application has been accompanied with a detailed heritage statement.
47. Previously, planning and listed building consent applications for extension of the listed building were refused by the National Park Authority for reasons, in part, which included because the heritage statement for the applications did not provide adequate information to allow a clear understanding of how the building evolved correctly over time, and therefore the impacts of the proposed works upon it.
48. The heritage statement accompanying this application has been updated to reflect these comments from the Authority's Built Environment Officer in particular regarding the phasing of the building.
49. Between 1900 and 1926 the building was operated as a creamery. After this date the building was converted back to a dwelling evidenced through a date stone. Historic mapping shows a large extension was built abutting the north of the house. Its adaption to a creamery and subsequent reconversion to residential later on demonstrates an unusual sequence of functional change that contributes to its historic interest.
50. The building typically dates 17th century in character as double chamfered mullion windows and cavetto molded drip molds feature alongside a steeply pitched roof form, sharp gables and molded kneelers. The front elevation has a symmetrical nature, common for 17th century context, alongside the chimney stack being in line with the front door suggesting an original lobby entrance.

51. Stylistically, nothing suggests the east and west parts of the dwelling are from different dates of construction.
52. The south elevation features gables of both ranges with clear unity and symmetry, as the creamery was configured.
53. Doors seen in photos in the heritage statement and sales particulars are of 6 panel design which indicates the floorplan of 1900 largely survives.
54. In regards to the rear elevation and extension, (staircase projection) this is a later extension with some windows dating 1926. However, the style of stonework and some of the windows are likely to place its construction around the same time as the rest of the house. The rear elevation of the front range also contains a mix of what would appear to be original windows.
55. Whilst this elevation does not contribute as much as the front elevation to the architectural interest of the building, the consistent architectural style and early fabric make an important contribution to the overall architectural significance of the building.
56. Therefore, the architectural significance derives from its layered development and its retention of historic fabric from different periods, vernacular construction and high-quality stone dressings which is clearly legible in its external appearance and layout. The character and form of the building are also evident in its historic use and function.
57. The building itself is visible from the public highway sited at the top of Creamery Lane on high ground. To this end it is also considered to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, its setting and local significance.
58. All of these factors all contribute to the heritage significance of the site, and any development should conserve and where appropriate enhance or further reveal its significance.
59. The proposed scheme has significant parallels with the previously refused applications; being a lean-to extension infilling the north eastern corner of the building. The difference being this design proposes a glass roof and would not cover the existing extension.
60. The extension now proposed would project from the north east corners of each range, wrapping around the existing extension, forming an 'L' shaped floor plan. The existing extension would project above the glazed roof.
61. As noted above, the structure would comprise of slim line metal with integrated doors and windows, on a random coursed stone dwarf wall. A section of the north elevation is to be have flat metal cladding finished in a powder coated green. The roof is to be fully patent glazed. This would introduce modern materials that would starkly contrast the existing.
62. For clarity, the existing listed dwelling and extension would be visible through the glazing, alongside the existing extension projecting beyond the roof plane.
63. As the extension would extend from the corner of the ranges fully filling the perimeter of the space available the form and massing of the extension would be of a substantial scale, encompassing the whole area and wrapping around the staircase.
64. The elevation would cut through all quoins and details on both ranges and as such is not subserviently stepped back from the gables.
65. The historic plan form would be amended as the ranges would become joined and an overall, almost square footprint would be created for the building.

66. By wrapping around the existing staircase, the roof of the existing extension would project above the proposed glazed roof, creating an arrangement of awkward planes that does not transition comfortably into onto another, losing fluidity of the building in this corner. Whilst this detail has been derived from comments regarding the covering of eaves and the angles of the roof in the previous scheme, this amendment is not considered an improvement or an acceptable way to mitigate previous design concern.
67. The eaves of the proposed is set below both the cornice details on the original part of the building and significantly below the eaves on the extension. Whilst this allows the angle of the glazed roof to match that of the existing extension, visual simplicity upon the original listed building is lost, in particularly when viewing the building from the east.
68. In regard to materials, proposing a fully glazed roof is not considered to improve the design. Whilst the glazing may allow the building to be seen beyond the glass, it would also mean the slimline metal frame would be seen over the historic features of the building, losing clarity of the elevation. Further, over time the domestication of the interior would also be viewed alongside the listed building, resulting in further harm to its significance, character and appearance.
69. The modern metal framed structure and powder coated panels are not considered to be a traditional material, at odds with the building. Further the scale of the glazing and its proportions and design do not reflect or respect the existing fenestration throughout the dwelling.
70. To that end, the proposal remains a bold, dominant, incongruous addition which is clearly not subordinate and would obscure much of the rear of the building resulting in less than substantial harm to the significance of the building. The obtrusive, unsympathetic and alien addition to the building would result in harm upon the details and architectural features, completely harming the character and appearance of the grade II building.
71. Whilst the application argues that the rear of the building would remain clearly distinguishable and visible through the glass, in practice this is rarely the case and does not make it acceptable. The reflectivity of the glass would obscure most of the interior and clash with the solidity of the rest of the building.
72. To that end it is considered the modern proposal significantly harms the significance, character, and appearance of the grade II building.
73. In addition, the extension would also require the linking through to the kitchen, necessitating the removal of part of the east ranges rear wall at ground floor level, including two windows, one which date from the 17th century. This would require removal and loss of historic fabric which would harm the building and its significance.
74. Therefore, the introduction of a fully glazed extension, wrapping around the existing solid extension, would result in a modern unsympathetic structure of a substantial size, scale and massing that would fill the north east area between the listed ranges. Even though the structure would be glazed throughout it would still cover or remove extensive architectural features that contribute to the significance of the building, or reflect or complement it. The proposal remains wholly at odds with the architectural character of the building which would significantly harm the architectural character of the building, and reduce its heritage significance.
75. Further, the NPPF, and policy DMC5 and DMC7, requires any harm to a designated heritage asset arising from planning proposals should be refused unless outweighed against the public benefits of the development.
76. The previously refused applications asserted that an extension in this location would help to improve the thermal performance of the building, over time reducing heating costs

which in the long term may secure further longevity. However, this is not considered to be a public benefit of any significance as the continued use of the building at present is highly likely. As such, this can be afforded very limited weight. Whilst energy efficiency improvements in general are a public benefit, at this scale they are very minor and would not outweigh the identified harm.

Conclusion

77. The proposal fails to demonstrate that the development would conserve the significance of the listed building or conservation area, to which the Authority must give special regard when assessing development proposals. There are no public benefits that outweigh the arising harm, or which would otherwise warrant granting listed building consent.

78. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Human Rights

79. Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

Nil

Report Author: Laura Buckley, Planning Assistant