
**MEMORANDUM
RYEDALE DISTRICT COUNCIL
FORWARD PLANNING & CONSERVATION**

TO: NIAMH BONNER- SENIOR PLANNING OFFICER
FROM: EMMA WOODLAND- SENIOR HERITAGE AND BUILDING CONSERVATION OFFICER
SUBJECT: 20/00823/FUL- RECTORY LANE, NUNNINGTON
DATE: 5TH NOVEMBER 2020

Objection

This development site lies in the Nunnington conservation area and as such, Ryedale District Council has a statutory duty to have special regard for the preservation or enhancement of the conservation area. In addition, paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 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.' In addition Paragraph 194 States '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.'

The character of the conservation area can be summarised as a rural village set within a wider agricultural setting at a strategic crossing point of the river Rye. Houses and cottages constructed from stone with pantile roofs are the predominant built form and the presence of Nunnington Hall and its wider estate, has influenced the form and character of the village. Green space reinforces the rural qualities of the village and green verges, domestic gardens, hedges and paddocks make an important contribution to the conservation area. Outbuildings also form an important part of the special qualities of the area and a number within the village contribute to the conservation area.

Rectory Lane is located mid point in the village and links the higher road to the south with the lower Church Street to the north. Its southern end is predominantly undeveloped excepting the semi -detached dwellings facing South to Low Street and the development site has an edge of village quality with sparse development beyond to the south and fields predominating. Due to the topography the street level drops as it runs north to the river and high embanked verges can be found on either side of the lane which flatten out at its northern end. A Public Right of Way lies to the west of the site which would likely give views looking east towards the proposed houses and gardens.

The character of the development site can be split into 2 distinct areas. The former abattoir site is located behind (west) of Smiths Cottage, a diminutive likely 19th century stone cottage. The former abattoir predominantly consists of mid-late 20th century structures which make no contribution to the conservation area. Permission for the re-development of this site for 2 houses was granted in 2016. The design of this approved scheme was informed by the back land location of the dwellings and proposed a simple agricultural

FORWARD PLANNING & CONSERVATION

Manager – Jill Thompson

outbuilding style for the properties with defined curtilages. The traditional stone and pantile outbuilding within the curtilage of the abattoir site on its southern boundary was retained.

The current proposal seeks additionally to include a paddock to the south of the abattoir site which is proposed to site 1 dwelling. The paddock includes a traditional stone and pantile outbuilding which is proposed for demolition.

In my opinion the principle of developing the paddock will cause harm to the conservation area. The paddock makes a strong contribution to the conservation area by virtue of its green and undeveloped state and additional presence of hedges. The stone and pantile outbuilding also contributes to the character of the conservation area and its location within the paddock amplifies its rural contribution and the interrelationship between the two strengthens their positive contribution. The presence of an outbuilding immediately adjacent outwith the development site to the south and the outbuilding on the southern boundary of the abattoir site adds an additional quality to this group and their intervisibility and group impact is strong. In my opinion the development of the paddock will cause a harmful impact to the character of the conservation area. It will cause a high level of permanent change from an undeveloped green space to a developed site. I also object to the demolition of the outbuilding which will be harmful to the conservation area. In my opinion due to the high level of permanent change, the level of harm to the conservation area is on the high end of less than substantial.

I have no objection in principle to the development of the abattoir site however I do object to the demolition of the traditional stone and pantile outbuilding on the southern boundary which makes a positive contribution to the conservation area and thought should be given to incorporating it into a proposal for re-development of the site.

Notwithstanding my lack of objection in principle to the development of the former abattoir, I do however have objection to the design of the new buildings. This is a backland site on a former abattoir and in my opinion the domestic nature of the proposed dwellings does not reflect this site specific context which will likely be viewed from the PROW to the west. I also have strong concern that the domestic curtilages of the dwellings has not been clearly defined. In addition, the roof proportions of the dwellings is weak and does not reflect local vernacular.

Notwithstanding the objection in principle to the development of the paddock site, I also have design concerns that due to rising ground levels to the south and the nature of this elevated site, that the dwelling proposed on the paddock will be overbearing in the street and not reflective of the other cottage like structures in the vicinity. I also have concerns regarding the potential for digging out to reduce ground levels and the possible necessity of retaining structures which would likely be harmful to the conservation area.

Paragraph 196 of the NPPF requires 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 including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use'. In my opinion the heritage benefits of developing the abattoir site do not outweigh the harm caused by the loss of the rural qualities of the paddock, the demolition of the outbuildings and my concerns regarding the design of the proposal.