



Northumberland County Council

Building Conservation-Ecology-Archaeology

MEMORANDUM

To: Colin Godfrey, Planning Officer

From: Val Robson, Building Conservation Officer

Date: 27/04/2020

Reference: 20NP0019LBC

Address: High Green Manor, Tarsset, NE48 1RP

Proposal: Removal of a later panel of stonework in the agricultural building known as the Danish Barn, insertion of gutter between Danish Barn and Unit 3

COMMENTS

Highgreen Manor is a grade II listed country house. The property dates from about 1885 when it comprised of two separate farmhouses. It was considerably altered and extended in 1894 in an elaborate free French/Scots Gothic style by the architect W.J. Ansell for use as a hunting lodge by the owner William T Bell. The 1894 southern and eastern elevations which were 'wrapped' around the original buildings were constructed from rock-faced stone with ashlar dressings with a Welsh slate roof, whilst the original elevations are from more random coursed sandstone.

Units 3 and 4 have undergone a number of phases of development. Pre 1860 they formed part of the original farmhouse. Between 1860-1894 the gabled off- shot was added with a catslide roof to the north. The Danish Barn was also built at this time. Between 1894-1898, W. J Ansell created the servants' wing by linking the existing farmhouse with the main body of the Manor, raising the roof and creating a covered archway link into the courtyard with rooms above. A room now known now as the Gunroom was also added to the East. Internally partition walls were added and the original farmhouse stairs were removed and 2 rather awkward stairs were added.

Unit 3 (The Cottage) was added in the early 20th century. At some point around this time the south side of the Danish Barn was filled-in creating the awkward relationship between it and Unit 3 and creating significant problems with water ingress and damp in this area.

An unsympathetic porch of poor quality was added to Unit 3 in the 1950s or 1960s and a doorway knocked through its south wall. The servants quarters were also sub- divided to create the two residential units now known as Units 3 and 4- hence this part of the building has undergone substantial alterations over time.

The collection of agricultural buildings to the rear of the manor house are interesting robust buildings that have been altered over time to be fit for purpose. The Danish Barn, which is assumed to have been built around 1885, has been altered significantly. Once open to the south, this open front was filled in in the early 20th century, presumably to separate the agricultural operations on the site from the domestic areas, an internal cross wall was removed and the new extension which was added at this time. Rudimentary new openings were made in the north facade in the early 20th century in conjunction with the filling in of the south side.

Legislative Framework and Policy

In providing comments on applications Building Conservation has regard to Section 16 (2) and Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which advise that In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, 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.

In addition, the NPPF is a material Planning consideration in the assessment of the application.

Section 12 of the 2018 NPPF is about achieving well-designed places.

Paragraph 124 of section 12 advises that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

Paragraph 130 of section 12 advises that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.

In addition, section 16 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment) of the 2018 NPPF is a material Planning consideration in the assessment of the application.

Paragraph 193 of the NPPF advises 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.

Paragraph 194 advises 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.

Paragraph 195 advises that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or 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.

Paragraph 196 advises 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.

Paragraph 197 advises that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Historic England's Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3 The Setting of Heritage Assets 2015 should also be taken into consideration in the assessment of this proposal.

Assessment of Development Proposals

The application proposes the removal of a panel of stonework in the Danish Barn. The reason for the removal is to protect and make it easier to repair and maintain a more significant part of the Manor House.

The proposal is to remove a 20th century infill panel of stonework which walled up the open south side of the Danish Barn when the access to the barn was turned round during works to extend the Manor House. It is then proposed to install 2 no circular steel columns replicating the columns that would have originally supported the roof. It may be possible to found the new posts on pre-existing stone plinths, if they exist, in which case the location of these will determine the post locations. If existing stone plinths are not discovered under the existing wall then new concrete pad foundations will be required. A wide gutter between the Danish barn and unit 3 is to be installed to prevent moisture getting to the base of the building. It is only proposed to remove the area of stonework adjacent to The Cottage. A wide gutter between the barn and unit 3 at high

level is also proposed to reduce water reaching the base of the wall.

The removal of the panel of stonework will enable access for remedial works to the main part of the house ; enable a drain to be put at the foot of the house wall to alleviate the historical damp issue; improve access for ongoing maintenance and enable air movement to be introduced to the whole area to allow the main house to dry out and importantly stay dry.

The impact of the proposed removal of the infill panel will significantly help with remedial work to preserve more significant parts of the main manor house. Given its location out of sight and in close proximity to the existing house it will have little impact on the significance of the main building.

CONCLUSION

Building Conservation support the proposed development subject to the following conditions:

1. A method statement indicating the precise means of taking down of the stone panel and making good any damage to adjacent stonework should be submitted and approved by the LPA before any works commence.
2. Details of the precise location, materials and size of the proposed columns and of any supporting foundations should be submitted and approved by the LPA before any works commence.
3. Details of the proposed guttering and its means of affixment should be submitted and approved by the LPA before any works commence.

Val Robson

Building Conservation Officer