



YORKSHIRE GARDENS TRUST

President: The Countess of Harewood

Vice-presidents: Lady Legard, Peter Goodchild, Nick Lane Fox

www.yorkshiregardenstrust.org.uk

Ms Hannah Blackburn
Planning Development Manager
Selby Area
North Yorkshire Council
planningcomments.sel@northyorks.gov.uk
Hannah.Blackburn@northyorks.gov.uk

Mrs Val Hepworth
Trustee
Conservation and Planning

conservation@yorkshiregardenstrust.org.uk

6th February 2024
Dear Ms Blackburn

2022/0003/FUL Conversion and change of use of ancillary building including new side extension to form one dwelling, Moreby Hall, Moreby, Stillingfleet. RECONSULTATION

Thank you for your e-mail and our very useful telephone conversation today. As you know the Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee with regards to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens – in this case Moreby Hall registered grade II with the house listed grade II*. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.

You will have on file our previous responses both to this application and the previous application:

For Ref: **2022/0003/FUL** we wrote on 31st January 2022 and for the Reconsultation our letter is dated 7th November 2023.

The previous application for the garage/ancillary building is Ref: **2020/0427/FUL** and you will have our responses/objections; 19th June 2020, 11th September 2020, 24th February and 17th May 2021. The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust were notified of the refusal of 2020/0427/FUL on 22nd October 2021 which we fully supported.

In response to our letter of 7th November in which we wrote that 'we would be pleased to learn of current proposals in terms of landscaping and car parking to allay our concerns otherwise we find we object to this planning application', it was very helpful to receive your explanatory e-mail of 26th January:

'Officers are trying to balance with this scheme the retention of the garage building (a specific request of the conservation officer), the indication from the landowner that the only viability means to keep this building was by conversion to a dwelling and the impact of the scheme in this sensitive historical context, with the listed hall and the listed park and garden.

In the meantime:

- *The car parking and refuse collection point for the proposed dwelling in the former garage building is to be confined to the existing car parking area agreed as part of the conversion of the main hall buildings to apartments.*
- *The curtilage around the building has been reduced to the elevations facing the hall buildings to protect the wider landscape and views of the hall and dwelling treated as another apartment with communal space rather than divided space.*
- *The number of openings have been reduced on the south and east facing elevations to reduce the impact when the building is viewed in longer distance views from the landscape and gardens.'*

It was also helpful to discuss this long-running application with you today and understand that the proposed dwelling would be treated as another apartment and therefore would not have a separate garden area with all the possible paraphernalia that might entail. There would also not be any separate boundary treatment of the property thus enabling the new dwelling/apartment to be seen as a continuum of the parkland as it has been historically.

We understand the balance that you and colleagues are trying to make and thank you for the information about car parking and the curtilage. It's difficult as this little building was never intended to be a habitable dwelling rather some sort of storage and its historic/existing footprint is quite small. The capital costs of making it into a dwelling now that there has been such a large increase in the cost of building materials (up to 40% in some cases) will be quite considerable. And this being the case and being practical, it's difficult to see how the only way the building can be saved is to convert it to housing. As you might expect in terms of the historic designed landscape and setting of the Hall, we would have had no objection to the garage building being repaired and used for some storage facility eg for maintenance equipment of the Hall or to rent out as a garage space.

We appreciate that you and your colleagues have put a good deal of effort over a long time into reworking the original scheme to reduce the harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets, and now in terms of potential impacts, we think that the building plus extension will be 'less than substantial harm', at the lower end of the scale.

If North Yorkshire Council is minded to approve the application, we strongly advise that permitted development rights should be removed so that future residents would need planning permission for those changes that usually fall under permitted development rights. If this is the case, then the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust withdraw their objection.

Yours sincerely,

Val Hepworth
Trustee Conservation and Planning

Cc. Yorkshire and the Northeast Historic England; conservation at the Gardens Trust