

**REPORT TO:** Cabinet Member (Planning & Transport)

**DATE:** 18 March 2009

**DEPARTMENT:** Development Services

**REPORTING OFFICER:** Head of Planning Services  
*(Mrs Ann Johnson, Principal Conservation and Design Officer)*

**SUBJECT:** **PROPOSED CONSULTATION ON DRAFT CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISALS FOR BILTON-IN-AINSTY, LOFTHOUSE, MARTON-CUM-GRAFTON, NUN MONKTON AND PANNAL**

**WARD/S AFFECTED:** Marston Moor, Pateley Bridge, Boroughbridge, Ouseburn and Pannal

**FORWARD PLAN REF:** Not Applicable

---

**1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1.1 This report seeks Cabinet Member approval of the draft Conservation Area Appraisals for Bilton-in-Ainsty, Lofthouse, Marton-cum-Grafton, Nun Monkton and Pannal as a basis for public consultation.

**2.0 RECOMMENDATION/S**

2.1 It is recommended that the Draft Bilton-in-Ainsty Conservation Area Appraisal, attached as Appendix 1 to this report, be approved as a basis for public consultation.

2.2 It is recommended that the Draft Lofthouse Conservation Area Appraisal, attached as Appendix 2 to this report, be approved as a basis for public consultation.

2.3 It is recommended that the Draft Marton-cum-Grafton Conservation Area Appraisal, attached as Appendix 3 to this report, be approved as a basis for public consultation.

- 2.4 It is recommended that the Draft Nun Monkton Conservation Area Appraisal, attached as Appendix 4 to this report, be approved as a basis for public consultation.
- 2.5 It is recommended that the Draft Pannal Conservation Area Appraisal, attached as Appendix 5 to this report, be approved as a basis for public consultation.
- 2.6 It is recommended that the consultation arrangements described in paragraphs **5.38 and 5.39** of this report be approved.

### **3.0 RECOMMENDED REASONS FOR DECISIONS**

- 3.1 To secure the preservation and enhancement of the Conservation Areas in accordance with the requirements of the 1990 Act, which requires the planning authority to review them from time to time and to prepare enhancement proposals for each.
- 3.2 The need for conservation area character appraisals is now set out in the Audit Commission's Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI) 219, which requires local planning authorities to undertake appraisals and review conservation areas at least every five years.
- 3.3 The public consultation on the Draft Conservation Area Appraisals is to ensure that the public have an opportunity to comment on the Appraisal reports in line with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

### **4.0 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND RECOMMENDED FOR REJECTION**

- 4.1 Not to prepare the Conservation Area Appraisals. This is rejected as it is important that conservation areas are reviewed in line with Government requirements so that they assist in securing the appropriate protection and enhancement measures. Failure to prepare the appraisal would mean the Council would fail to meet the BVPI target of up to date conservation area appraisals.
- 4.2 Not to consult on the Draft Conservation Area Appraisals. This is rejected as without consultation the appraisals would have limited weight and the work that the local communities have contributed to the process would be devalued.

### **5.0 THE REPORT**

- 5.1 The appraisal process for these five Conservation Area Appraisals has been identical to that of the first two pilot areas, Whixley and Glasshouses.

5.2 Workshops were held in each of the villages at the start of the appraisal process. The workshops were attended by local people and have proved to be a valuable part of the appraisal process. Attendees identified what was important to them and what contributed positively to the character of the village. Key issues raised at workshops are detailed below and these have been incorporated into the Draft Appraisals:

- The preservation of important views;
- Identifying buildings of local interest;
- Suggestions to changes to the extent of the conservation area;
- The retention of important boundary walls;
- The retention and management of trees;

5.3 Using the information generated by the workshops and in the existing conservation area statements and following further visual survey work, the draft appraisals have been prepared in the form previously agreed.

5.4 Alterations to the conservation area boundaries were proposed by those attending the workshops. These are reported in Appendix A of the Draft Appraisals. Officers have considered whether the proposed new areas are of sufficient special architectural or historic interest to include within the respective conservation areas.

### **Bilton-in-Ainsty**

5.5 A workshop to initiate the review process of Bilton-in-Ainsty Conservation Area was held on Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2008.

5.6 Two alterations to the conservation area boundary were proposed by those attending the workshop in Bilton-in-Ainsty. The first was to exclude the two large arable fields which border the eastern side of Church Street. The reason was that these fields are not parkland and are not different from any other fields in the village. A study of historic maps confirmed that these fields have never formed part of Bilton Park, The fields are intensively farmed arable land. It is agreed that the exclusion of the fields from the conservation area would not harm its special architectural or historic interest and would create a more logical boundary.

5.7 The second boundary change involves the exclusion of two different but related sites. One is the field bounded by York Road to the north and Church Walk to the East. The other is the field to the southwest of the fishpond in Bilton Park. The reason for the suggestion is that the fields are no longer parkland. The fields are however historically part of the parkland and still appear to form part of the Park despite their change of use. In addition both fields retain important groups of trees, which are part of the historical landscape of the Park and contribute to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. It is considered that it would be inappropriate to exclude these fields from the Conservation Area.

5.8 Following the site survey, officers proposed slight amendments to the boundary to ensure that it follows physical boundaries and does not cut through buildings or garden areas. Properties affected are Bilton Brow, The Chequers, Village Farm, 8-9 Westlands and Grove Cottage.

- 5.9 The Draft Bilton-in-Ainsty Conservation Area Appraisal is attached at Appendix 1.

### **Lofthouse**

- 5.10 A workshop to initiate the review process of Lofthouse Conservation Area was held on Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> July 2008. Those attending the workshop were concerned that not all the residents were there and decided to defer identifying what was important to them and what contributed positively to the character of the village until they were able to consult the other residents. The chosen representative later sent the findings of the group to Conservation Officers.
- 5.11 The residents of Lofthouse proposed one alteration to the conservation area boundary. This was to include the trees on the southern bank of the River Nidd opposite the houses on the valley road. The reason for the suggestion is that the trees contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area and help to enclose the village. A survey confirmed this and moreover the trees also line the old track that leads to the settled ford, which is the earliest crossing point in the vicinity. It is therefore proposed that the conservation area is extended to include the trees, the ford and stepping-stones.
- 5.12 The re-survey has resulted in two boundary changes being proposed by officers. The first is to include the recently converted barn called "The Byre", which was concealed by modern agricultural sheds and a slurry tank in 1994, at the time of the designation of the conservation area. The area including the barn is now complementary to the character of the village and should be included in the conservation area.
- 5.13 The second addition proposed by officers is to include the village pump, which stands in front of 10 Nidd View and the high boundary wall leading to it. Other very minor alterations have been proposed to ensure that the boundary follows property boundaries.
- 5.14 The Draft Lofthouse Conservation Area Appraisal is attached at Appendix 2.

### **Marton-cum-Grafton**

- 5.15 A workshop to initiate the review process of Marton-cum-Grafton Conservation Area was held on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2008.
- 5.16 Five alterations to the conservation area boundary were proposed by those attending the workshop in Marton-cum-Grafton. The first was to include the development known as the Orchards and the field on the opposite side of Main Street. The houses are of no historic interest, nor are they of sufficient architectural interest to include them in the conservation area. Neither is there any particular historic or other special interest to warrant the inclusion of the field.
- 5.17 The second proposed extension was to include land behind properties on the west of Main Street. The land behind the Old Smithy continues to have boundaries on the line of the old toft boundaries, which are of historic interest. Additionally the current conservation area boundary cuts across land within the same ownership and should be rationalised. It is proposed that the former toft is to be included into this rationalisation and the conservation area be extended.

- 5.18 Another proposal incorporated a much larger area of land to the west of Marton up to Limebar Lane. Whilst much of the land in question does not have intrinsic value, the open area of land between the two settlements of Marton and Grafton is very important to the character of the conservation area. The current boundary cuts across this field and it is proposed that the whole field is incorporated.
- 5.19 Residents suggested that the fields to the north of Grafton are included in the conservation area. These fields do contribute to the setting of the conservation area, but have no intrinsic interest and their inclusion is not supported by officers.
- 5.20 The last alteration suggested by residents is the inclusion of the buildings of Thornhill Farm and the graveyard on Legram Lane. The buildings are of no architectural or historic interest. The graveyard is of historic interest, however there are no remains of the church and there are no listed memorials, therefore it is not of special architectural interest. In addition the graveyard is detached from the village. This extension to the conservation area is not supported by officers.
- 5.21 Following the site survey, officers proposed minor amendments to the conservation area boundary to ensure that it follows physical boundaries and does not cut through buildings or garden areas. Properties affected are the houses at the rear of Peach Tree Farm, Marton and at The Croft, Grafton.
- 5.22 The Draft Marton-cum-Grafton Conservation Area Appraisal is attached at Appendix 3.

### **Nun Monkton**

- 5.23 A workshop to initiate the review process of Nun Monkton Conservation Area was held on Saturday 15<sup>th</sup> November 2008.
- 5.24 Four alterations to the conservation area boundary were proposed by those attending the workshop in Nun Monkton. The first was to include properties in the northwest and southwest corners of the village within the conservation area. The buildings, White Horse and its neighbour in the northeast and Willow Dene in the southwest, are of recent construction and are not considered to be of sufficient architectural interest to merit inclusion.
- 5.25 Residents suggested a logical redrawing of the boundary to include areas partly excluded at 8 & 9 The Paddocks. This is supported by officers.
- 5.26 The third proposed alteration was the inclusion of parkland and Dock Mire, a flood meadow rich in wildlife and biodiversity. It is considered by design and conservation officers that it may be appropriate to nominate the site to be a SINC (Site of Importance for Nature Conservation), which would give some protection to the wildlife and plant life. The land does impact on the setting of the conservation area giving it some degree of protection and its inclusion in the conservation area is not supported.
- 5.27 The final extension suggested by residents is up to the proposed cattle grid west of the village. The agricultural fields and hedgerows flanking both sides of the approach road into the village are not considered to have intrinsic value and as such their inclusion is not supported.
- 5.28 The Draft Nun Monkton Conservation Area Appraisal is attached at Appendix 4.

## **Pannal**

- 5.29 A workshop to initiate the review process of Pannal Conservation Area was held on Tuesday 20 May 2008. The workshop was an interesting and valuable process attended by local people. Attendees identified what was important to them and what contributed positively to the character of the village
- 5.30 A number of alterations to the conservation area boundary were proposed by those attending the workshop in Pannal. The first was to include Woodcock Hill and Spring Lane. Within this area there are a number of locally important buildings including the old schoolroom and the proposed extension to the conservation area is supported by officers.
- 5.31 The second suggestion was the inclusion of the Maltings and the footpath to Allen Woods. Also suggested was the inclusion of the old dam. Although altered, the group of C18 and C19 buildings at the Old Maltings is of architectural and historic interest. This group of buildings, although somewhat detached from the existing conservation area, is linked to it by the Ringway footpath and the former mill leat, which is of historic interest. It is proposed that the former industrial buildings and the filled in mill pond on Malthouse Lane be included in the conservation area.
- 5.32 The inclusion of Allen Woods was proposed by residents. The woodland is an important element in the wider setting of the conservation area, however it is detached from the historic core of Pannal. It is considered that other protective measures such as tree preservation orders or designation as a SINIC may be more appropriate. Officers do not support the proposed extension to the conservation area.
- 5.33 Residents also proposed the inclusion of the footpath to the playing field at the rear of Rosedale. This footpath from Spring Lane is detached from the historic core of the village and is hemmed in by post-war development and does not merit inclusion.
- 5.34 Residents wished the Memorial Hall, cottages and station building to be in the conservation area. The area between Pannal Bridge and Leeds Road was developed in C20. The older buildings have been much altered and are very much detached from the historic core of Pannal. For these reasons, officers do not support their inclusion.
- 5.35 The extension of the conservation area to Burn Bridge was proposed. Whilst Burn Bridge contains some buildings of local interest, it is clearly detached from the village and does not merit inclusion in the conservation area.
- 5.36 Finally the exclusion of 37-43 Main Street from the conservation area was suggested. These brick hipped roofed houses of 1930s do not add anything of distinctly local character, but they are behind stone boundary walls and thus do not detract unduly. For this reason, it is considered the conservation boundary should remain unchanged here.
- 5.37 The Draft Pannal Conservation Area Appraisal is attached at Appendix 5.

## **Consultation**

- 5.38 The public consultation on the five Draft Conservation Area Appraisals will be carried out in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and in the same manner that other LDF documents. It is intended that a letter be sent to all those who attended the workshops and the other stakeholders and statutory consultees. Also there will be a press release to publicise that a consultation is taking place and where the document may be seen on the website or hard copies obtained. The consultees will include NYCC, English Heritage, the parish councils, amenity associations, agents and the like as well as other sections and departments of the Council. As promised, a copy of the draft documents will be sent to all those who took part in the workshop. (In future we will ask the residents to look at documents on the Council's website, which is more sustainable).
- 5.39 At the end of the consultation period, which will be six weeks, the responses to the consultation will be considered and incorporated into the documents as appropriate. Officers will report back to the Cabinet Member to ask for approval of the Appraisals as part of the evidence base for the LDF and for approval for the management proposals to be adopted for development control purposes. At this time the management proposals will not be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), rather the intention is to prepare an SPD incorporating the management proposals for a number of conservation areas together (including the preparation of a sustainability appraisal as appropriate). Where any new areas are to be included within conservation areas, the reasoning behind their inclusion shall be reported back and officers will request approval for the commencement of the formal designation procedure.

## **6.0 CONCLUSION**

- 6.1 The Conservation Area Appraisals for Bilton-in-Ainsty, Lofthouse, Marton-cum-Grafton, Nun Monkton and Pannal have been drafted following successful community engagement with local residents. The Appraisal documents, at Appendices 1 to 5, need to undergo full public consultation in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement, prior to being adopted for use as an evidence base for the LDF and for determining planning applications and defending appeals.

### **Background Papers - None**

**OFFICER CONTACT:** Please contact Mrs Ann Johnson if you require any further information on the contents of this report. The officer can be contacted at Department of Development Services, Knapping Mount, West Grove Road, Harrogate, HG1 2AE by telephone on 01423 556591 or email: [ann.johnson@harrogate.gov.uk](mailto:ann.johnson@harrogate.gov.uk)

## SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENT / POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

		Implications are		
		Positive	Neutral	Negative
A	Economy		✓	
B	Environment	✓		
C	Social Equity		✓	
i)	General		✓	
ii)	Customer Care / People with Disabilities		✓	
iii)	Health Implications		✓	
D	Crime and Disorder Implications	✓		

If all comments lie within the shaded areas, the proposal is sustainable.