

From: No Reply Web
Sent: 06 May 2025 18:52
To: Development Control
Subject: Comment from Online Planning System

Reference: 4/25/2121/OL1

Submitted on Tuesday, 6 May 2025 - 5:51pm Submitted values are:

Application: 4/25/2121/OL1

Name: Ross Anthony

Address: Historic Buildings and Places (AMS), The Courtyard, 37 Spital Square

Email:

Comments:

FAO: Christopher Harrison

Address: Scalegillhall Farm, Scalegill Road, Moor Row, CA24 3JY Application Ref: 4/25/2120/OF1 and 4/25/2121/OL1

Proposal: Listed building consent for hybrid planning application for the redevelopment of Scalegill Hall farm including full planning permission for the demolition of redundant farm buildings, the refurbishment of Scalegill Hall, conversion of a barn to two dwellings and outline planning permission for residential development with all matters reserved except access.

Statutory Remit: Historic Buildings & Places (formerly the AMS) is a consultee for Listed Building Consent applications, as per the Arrangements for handling heritage applications – notification to Historic England and National Amenity Societies and the Secretary of State (England) Direction 2021. We are concerned with historic assets of all types and all ages, including conservation areas and undesignated heritage.

Comments: Thank you for notifying HB&P of the above applications for hybrid planning and listed building consent. HB&P strongly objected to the previous scheme for this site in 2022 (application ref 4/21/2559/OL1) due to the lack of a satisfactory heritage statement and building impact assessment to justify the works to the farmhouse and demolition of the out buildings. It is vital that this is carried out to inform the appropriateness of the alterations proposed, such as the replacement windows, removal of the rear stair, insertion of new plaster work, etc. We also raised concerns that there was no assessment of how the new 'enabling development' would impact the setting of the farmyard and potentially harm the ability to understand the historic layout of the farmyard an relationship between the buildings.

We note the barn will now be retained and are supportive of its reuse, as well as the principal of the restoration of the farmhouse. However, it is disappointing that the heritage statement remains poor and again fails to provide an appropriate analysis of the fabric and significance of the farm house, being the host heritage asset, or the collection of curtilage listed out buildings. The list description suggests one dates from 1615 and would be demolished with no effort made into substantiating this date or to consider its role within the context of the wider farm yard, or the ability to restore and reuse these buildings.

For the sake of brevity, HB&P note and endorse the comments already provided by your conservation officer. HB&P must object at this stage and request that a fully detailed heritage statement and impact assessment, prepared by a suitably qualified conservation professional, is

submitted, together with amended plans that reflect the findings of the assessment. We would be happy to review the scheme again at that time.

Policy: Chapter 16 of the NPPF (2024), particularly paragraph 212, states: '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'.

Section 16 (2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that, in considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works 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.

Ross Anthony
HB&P Casework
Summary of response: Object