

COMMITTEE REPORT

APPLICATION DETAILS

APPLICATION No:	1) DM/20/01183/FPA
APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:	Repurposing of existing buildings for mixed tourism, leisure and educational uses, formation of a new car park, creation of play facilities, erection of new visitor arrival building and winery cafe, works to Walled Garden and associated infrastructure and landscaping
APPLICATION No:	2) DM/20/01184/LB
APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:	Refurbishment and alterations to Riding School (UID 1121778); Dutch Barn (UID 1121777); Stables and Coach House (List UID 1121776); Garden Walls (UID 1121780); and Cistern in Walled Garden (1310785)
NAME OF APPLICANT:	Raby Estates
ADDRESS:	Raby Castle, Raby Park, Staindrop, Bishop Auckland, DL2 3AH
ELECTORAL DIVISION:	Barnard Castle East
CASE OFFICER:	Laura Eden Senior Planning Officer 03000 263980 laura.eden@durham.gov.uk

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND PROPOSALS

The Site

1. Raby Castle Park and Gardens is an established tourism site which benefits from significant visitor numbers. The application site lies immediately to the north of Raby Castle and extends to approximately 8.7ha. The site comprises of parkland, gardens and buildings within the wider Raby Castle Park and Garden Estate. It lies approximately 1.2km to the north of the existing built up area of Staindrop Village.
2. The site is accessed from the west, off the A688 Keeverstone Bank through a gated access at North Lodge. There are no Public Rights of Way within the development site. Public Footpath No.2 (Raby with Keeverstone) runs from North Lodge, north towards Cockfield.

3. The site contains a number of listed buildings most notably the Stables and Coach House building (Grade II*), the Dutch Barn (Grade II*), Riding School (Grade II), the Walled Gardens (Grade II) and a cistern within the Walled Gardens (grade II) in addition to some curtilage listed buildings such as the conservatory and vinery. The site is set within 200 acres of deer park with the parkland registered as Grade II*. Land further to the west is on the local list of historic parks, gardens and designated landscapes. Raby Castle (Grade I) and Staindrop Conservation Area lie within 100m and 1.2km respectively of the southern boundary of the site. Some 1.5km to the north of the site lies Cockfield Conservation Area.
4. The site falls entirely within an Area of High Landscape Value. There are no statutory or locally designated ecological sites located within or immediately adjacent to the application site.

The Proposal

5. This report relates to two separate but related applications.

DM/20/01183/FPA

6. This application seeks full planning permission for the repurposing of existing buildings for mixed tourism, leisure and educational uses, formation of a new car park, creation of play facilities, erection of new visitor arrival building and vinery cafe, works to Walled Garden and associated infrastructure and landscaping.

DM/20/01184/LB

7. Listed Building Consent is also sought for the refurbishment and alterations to Riding School; Dutch Barn; Stables and Coach House; Garden Walls; and Cistern in Walled Garden.
8. A summary of the works proposed as part of both applications is set out below;
 - Repair and minor alterations to the Coach House, to offer space for the display of coaches and important stable fittings; education space; interpretation space for the Estate and Walled Garden areas with potential to accommodate some retail space for Castle merchandise, a studio flat and office space.
 - Repair and minor alterations to the Riding School to allow it to act as a “stone marquee” which could accommodate events, exhibitions, retail opportunities/concessions, supported by the provision of minimal power, lighting, water and drainage services.
 - Repair of the Dutch Barn, with removal of the non-original timber infill to the eastern bay. Minimal service provision through the use of ‘pop up’ service bollards will allow the space to serve as a covered farmer’s market or other uses requiring a roof as may occur.
 - The Conservatory within the walled garden will be rebuilt, to almost its original extent, using the drawings prepared at the time of its reduction in 1981. This will continue to incorporate the original fabric retained at that time. The Conservatory will be used to offer table service catering (80 covers) within the Walled Garden.
 - The Vinery building will contain a large self-service café within a glasshouse rebuilt on almost the original footprint, with the retained sheds behind used to contain kitchens, storage and WCs. To access the new service yard, vehicles will pass over a new bridge across the ha-ha.
 - Creation of a new build Visitor Centre located at the centre of the Walled Gardens area, and at the focus of the entry route from the car park. Its function will be both

to provide information and way-finding advice to visitors and be the point of sale of tickets for visitors to the Walled Gardens and the Castle.

- A re-planted and landscaped Walled Garden, retaining the present division into three areas. No alterations are proposed except the rebuilding of some parts at the north-west edge of the central garden, where the Conservatory is being put back and the formation of two new openings in the centre of the dividing walls between the central garden and those to each side. A Lead Cistern is proposed to be relocated within the garden.
- Sustainable heating and power to all of these buildings, through the use of a new Combined Heat and Power unit, to be placed in the refurbished structures, currently unused, and known as the Bull House and adjoining shed.
- New car parking and coach parking provision.
- Introduction of new play equipment within the plantation of spruce to the north of the proposed carpark, on the site of a former estate plant nursery. Two small timber buildings are proposed within this area comprising of a small-scale catering outlet and timber clad toilet. A ticketing building, associated within the car park, is proposed within the car park.
- A comprehensive landscape strategy throughout the application site.

9. The applications are being reported to the County Planning Committee as it relates to a non-residential development proposal exceeding 2ha.

PLANNING HISTORY

10. There have been various minor proposals at the site however none which are relevant to the determination of these applications.

11. The Local Planning Authority is currently considering two other applications submitted on behalf of Raby Estates. There is a proposal for 79no. housing units at Gainford (DM/20/01205/FPA) in addition to a further application (DM/20/01185/FPA) for 72no. housing units at Staindrop. The housing applications have been submitted on the basis that they are '*enabling development*'. Residential development at Staindrop will generate revenue (£1,958,813), alongside revenue (£980,593), generated from another proposed housing development at Gainford (DM/20/01205/FPA) which would be directed to heritage works proposed at Raby Castle, Park and Gardens.

PLANNING POLICY

NATIONAL POLICY

12. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in July 2018 (with updates since). The overriding message continues to be that new development that is sustainable should go ahead without delay. It defines the role of planning in achieving sustainable development under three overarching objectives – economic, social and environmental, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways.

13. In accordance with Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework, existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of this Framework. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with the Framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given). The relevance of this issue is discussed, where appropriate, in the assessment section of the report. The following elements of the NPPF are considered relevant to this proposal.

14. *NPPF Part 2 - Achieving Sustainable Development.* The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and therefore at the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. It defines the role of planning in achieving sustainable development under three overarching objectives - economic, social and environmental, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways. The application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development for plan-making and decision-taking is outlined.
15. *NPPF Part 4 - Decision-making.* Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.
16. *NPPF Part 6 – Building a strong, competitive economy.* The Government is committed to securing economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity, building on the country's inherent strengths, and to meeting the twin challenges of global competition and a low carbon future.
17. *NPPF Part 8 – Promoting healthy and safe communities.* The planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. *Developments* should be safe and accessible; Local Planning Authorities should plan positively for the provision and use of shared space and community facilities. An integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and services should be adopted.
18. *NPPF Part 9 – Promoting sustainable transport.* Encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. Developments that generate significant movement should be located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes maximised.
19. *NPPF Part 11 – Making effective use of land.* Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. Strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously-developed or 'brownfield' land.
20. *NPPF Part 12 – Achieving well-designed places* The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment, with good design a key aspect of sustainable development, indivisible from good planning.
21. *NPPF Part 14 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change*
- The planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure.
22. *NPPF Part 15 - Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment* - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment. The Planning System should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued

landscapes, geological conservation interests, recognising the wider benefits of ecosystems, minimising the impacts on biodiversity, preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from pollution and land stability and remediating contaminated or other degraded land where appropriate.

23. *NPPF Part 16 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment* - Heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework>

24. The Government has consolidated a number of planning practice guidance notes, circulars and other guidance documents into a single Planning Practice Guidance Suite. This document provides planning guidance on a wide range of matters. Of particular relevance to this application is the practice guidance with regards to; air quality; historic environment; design process and tools; determining a planning application; flood risk; healthy and safe communities; land stability; land affected by contamination; light pollution; natural environment; neighbourhood planning; noise; open space, sports and recreation facilities, public rights of way and local green space; planning obligations; travel plans, transport assessments and statements; use of planning conditions; viability and; water supply, wastewater and water quality.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance>

LOCAL PLAN POLICY:

The County Durham Plan

25. *Policy 7 – Visitor Attractions*. The visitor sector is an important and resilient part of the county's economy. In order to raise the quality of the visitor experience, the provision of new visitor attractions, or the expansion of existing attractions will be permitted provided they are located in sustainable and accessible locations, or can be made so; appropriate to the site's location in terms of scale, design, layout and materials; it can demonstrate the viability of the new attraction or, where appropriate, helps support the viability of an existing attraction; and it enhances and complements existing visitor attractions or priorities in the county and supports the development of a year-round visitor economy and/or extends visitor stays. Developments in the countryside should meet identified visitor needs; support local employment; ensure adequate infrastructure and respect the character of the countryside. Comprehensive masterplanning and a robust business plan to articulate the potential impacts, proposed mitigation and economic, social and environmental benefits should accompany applications for large scale new or expanding visitor attractions.
26. *Policy 10 – Development in the Countryside*. Development in the countryside will not be permitted unless allowed for by specific policies in the Plan, relevant policies within an adopted neighbourhood plan relating to the application site or where the proposal relates to one or more of the following exceptions; economic development, infrastructure development or the development of existing buildings. New development in the countryside must accord with all other relevant development plan policies and general design principles.
27. *Policy 21 - Delivering Sustainable Transport*. Requires all development to deliver sustainable transport by: delivering, accommodating and facilitating investment in

sustainable modes of transport; providing appropriate, well designed, permeable and direct routes for all modes of transport; ensuring that any vehicular traffic generated by new development can be safely accommodated; creating new or improvements to existing routes and assessing potential increase in risk resulting from new development in vicinity of level crossings. Development should have regard to Parking and Accessibility Supplementary Planning Document.

28. **Policy 25 - Developer Contributions.** Advises that any mitigation necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms will be secured through appropriate planning conditions or planning obligations. Planning conditions will be imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. Planning obligations must be directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
29. **Policy 26 – Green Infrastructure.** States that development will be expected to maintain and protect, and where appropriate improve, the County’s green infrastructure network. Advice is provided on the circumstances in which existing green infrastructure may be lost to development, the requirements of new provision within development proposals and advice in regard to public rights of way.
30. **Policy 29 – Sustainable Design.** Requires all development proposals to achieve well designed buildings and places having regard to SPD advice and sets out detailed criteria which sets out that where relevant development is required to meet including; making a positive contribution to an areas character and identity; provide adaptable buildings; minimise greenhouse gas emissions and use of non renewable resources; providing high standards of amenity and privacy; contributing to healthy neighbourhoods; providing suitable landscape proposals; provide convenient access for all users; adhere to the Nationally Described Space Standards (subject to transition period).
31. **Policy 31 - Amenity and Pollution.** Sets out that development will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that there will be no unacceptable impact, either individually or cumulatively, on health, living or working conditions or the natural environment and that they can be integrated effectively with any existing business and community facilities. Development will not be permitted where inappropriate odours, noise, vibration and other sources of pollution cannot be suitably mitigated against, as well as where light pollution is not suitably minimised. Permission will not be granted for sensitive land uses near to potentially polluting development. Similarly, potentially polluting development will not be permitted near sensitive uses unless the effects can be mitigated.
32. **Policy 32 - Despoiled, Degraded, Derelict, Contaminated and Unstable Land.** Requires that where development involves such land, any necessary mitigation measures to make the site safe for local communities and the environment are undertaken prior to the construction or occupation of the proposed development and that all necessary assessments are undertaken by a suitably qualified person.
33. **Policy 35 - Water Management.** Requires all development proposals to consider the effect of the proposed development on flood risk, both on-site and off-site, commensurate with the scale and impact of the development and taking into account the predicted impacts of climate change for the lifetime of the proposal. All new development must ensure there is no net increase in surface water runoff for the lifetime of the development. Amongst its advice, the policy advocates the use of SuDS and aims to protect the quality of water.

34. *Policy 36 - Water Infrastructure.* Advocates a hierarchy of drainage options for the disposal of foul water. Applications involving the use of non-mains methods of drainage will not be permitted in areas where public sewerage exists. New sewage and waste water infrastructure will be approved unless the adverse impacts outweigh the benefits of the infrastructure. Proposals seeking to mitigate flooding in appropriate locations will be permitted though flood defence infrastructure will only be permitted where it is demonstrated as being the most sustainable response to the flood threat.
35. *Policy 39 – Landscape.* Proposals for new development will only be permitted where they would not cause unacceptable harm to the character, quality or distinctiveness of the landscape, or to important features or views. Proposals are expected to incorporate appropriate mitigation measures where adverse impacts occur. Development affecting Areas of Higher landscape Value will only be permitted where it conserves and enhances the special qualities, unless the benefits of the development clearly outweigh its impacts.
36. *Policy 40 - Trees, Woodlands and Hedges.* Proposals for new development will not be permitted that would result in the loss of, or damage to, trees, hedges or woodland of high landscape, amenity or biodiversity value unless the benefits of the scheme clearly outweigh the harm. Proposals for new development will be expected to retain existing trees and hedges or provide suitable replacement planting. The loss or deterioration of ancient woodland will require wholly exceptional reasons and appropriate compensation.
37. *Policy 41 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity.* Restricts development that would result in significant harm to biodiversity or geodiversity and cannot be mitigated or compensated. The retention and enhancement of existing biodiversity assets and features is required as are biodiversity net gains. Proposals must protect geological features, have regard to Geodiversity Action Plans and the Durham Geodiversity Audit and where appropriate promote public access, appreciation and interpretation of geodiversity.
38. *Policy 43 - Protected Species and Nationally and Locally Protected Sites.* Development proposals that would adversely impact upon nationally protected sites will only be permitted where the benefits clearly outweigh the impacts whilst adverse impacts upon locally designated sites will only be permitted where the benefits outweigh the adverse impacts. Appropriate mitigation or, as a last resort, compensation must be provided where adverse impacts are expected. In relation to protected species and their habitats, all development likely to have an adverse impact on the species' abilities to survive and maintain their distribution will not be permitted unless appropriate mitigation is provided or the proposal meets licensing criteria in relation to European protected species.
39. *Policy 44 - Historic Environment.* Seeks to ensure that developments should contribute positively to the built and historic environment and seek opportunities to enhance and, where appropriate, better reveal the significance and understanding of heritage assets. The policy advises on when harm or total loss of the significance of heritage assets can be accepted and the circumstances/levels of public benefit which must apply in those instances.

CONSULTATION AND PUBLICITY RESPONSES

STATUTORY RESPONSES:

40. *Raby and Keverstone Parish Council* – No comments received.

41. *Highway Authority* – The Transport Assessment demonstrates that the traffic flows associated with the proposed development, including ‘Event’ Day traffic, will be satisfactorily accommodated on the local road network and no mitigation is required. The increased and formalised visitor parking provision is considered appropriate to accommodate the additional demand. Cycle parking provision and improved access to existing bus stops should be secured by condition. No objection is raised subject to the imposition of relevant conditions.
42. *Drainage and Coastal Protection* – The proposed design demonstrates compliance with National Standards and Council Policies in providing sustainable surface water management solutions and ensuring the prevention of flood risk to and from the proposed development. No objection is raised subject to a condition to secure the implementation of the approved scheme.
43. *Historic England* – Supports these applications. Overall, they consider that the proposals would considerably enhance the historic environment of Raby through investing in its spaces and buildings and facilitating increased appreciation of them. This is achieved in a sensitive and creative way that not only conserves but adds a new layer to the estate. The proposals are a good example of sustainable development as defined within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) for the way it would increase economic activity through the sympathetic use of built and natural heritage. This is reflected in paragraph 192 of the NPPF which considers the value of heritage to economic and social well-being.
44. *Environment Agency* – No objection to the planning application as submitted. This development will require a permit under Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016 from the Environment Agency.
45. *National Amenity Society* – No comments received.
46. *The Garden Trust* – In relation to archaeological investigation, it is considered the overall project lacks information, analysis and investigation. Unless a written scheme of investigation is agreed before work commences they will object to the scheme. It is recommended that there is additional peripheral planting to the ends of the new car park to help better screen it. It is queried whether some elements of the play area will be seen above the tree canopies.
47. *Garden History Society* – No comments received.

INTERNAL CONSULTEE RESPONSES:

48. *Spatial Policy* – The Local Plan is largely supportive of tourist development in countryside locations subject to the criteria set out above. It does however make clear that any adverse impact on the landscape or historical environment should be minimal, and harm to listed buildings would not be permitted. National guidance is supportive of proposals which help conserve and enhance the historic environment and the rural economy, subject to ensuring sustainable development within the context of environment, social and economic considerations. It is naturally less prescriptive, and detailed, than the local plan, however it places additional controls in some areas, for example in respect to managing traffic and biodiversity issues. As the policies which are most important for determining the application are consistent with the NPPF, with the exception of TR2, the two-limbed test set out in NPPF paragraph 11 does not apply here. The application should be assessed based on the likely benefits to the rural economy and tourism in County Durham, and to the conservation of Raby Castle, against potential harm to the historic character of the site, its listed buildings, and any

harm arising from the site's location adjacent to the AHLV, as well as any harm to biodiversity and transport impacts.

49. *Archaeology* – No objection. The trial trench evaluation has confirmed the presence of remains from the former WWII camp on site. The heritage assessment which has also been submitted identifies some areas of archaeological potential. The impact of the development can be mitigated through a small excavation in the area of the car park and watching briefs to monitor works in the gardens to be secured via condition.
50. *Design and Conservation* – These proposals offer a unique and comprehensive, once in a generation opportunity to restore and repurpose one of the most significant sections of the Raby Estate, increasing public access to the heritage and contributing to the visitor economy of the County. It is exceptionally well researched, carefully considered and sensitive to the significance of each component part delivering a scheme which will leave the estate in a substantially improved position on completion. The proposals are considered to be policy compliant and any minor harm to significance is considerably outweighed by the public benefits associated with the proposals. On this basis full support is given to the approval of these applications subject to securing further detail by condition, to ensure that the promised quality is delivered.
51. *Ecology* – Raise no objection to the scheme subject to conditions being imposed to secure the recommendations and compensation outlined within the submitted ecological reports, including but not restricted to the acquisition of a relevant protected species license prior to any works commencing on specified buildings, with all works to be undertaken in strict accordance with the conditions of the licence including the installation of alternative bat roosting opportunities and the sensitive timing of works to avoid the hibernation period. Furthermore, net gains and the long-term management and maintenance of the biodiversity land would need to be secured.
52. *Environment, Health and Consumer Protection (Air Quality)* – Overall, it is considered that the air quality assessment uses current best practice methods to consider the effects of emissions to air associated with the proposed development. Provided that the recommended mitigation measures are included in a Dust Management Plan (or similar), and effectively implemented when necessary, it is agreed that the proposed development should be acceptable in terms of its effect on local air quality. The proposal includes the installation of CHP plant. The applicant will be required to complete the Defra combined heat and power (CHP) Emissions screening tool to allow for consideration in terms of air quality threshold levels. It is also considered that completion of the above screening tool will demonstrate adherence with the Clean Air Act 1993 in relation to chimney height approval.
53. *Environment, Health and Consumer Protection (Pollution Control)* – The development is removed from sensitive receptors therefore it is not expected that noise and odour will have an adverse impact on amenity. A condition to secure extraction details would be beneficial to consider food legislative requirements, odour/noise impact in relation to site operations and design.
54. *Environment, Health and Consumer Protection (Contaminated Land)* – Advise a conditional approach in relation to land contamination.
55. *Landscape* – The proposals are well considered and well resolved. Taken in the round it is considered that the effects of the proposals would be beneficial, with some localised harm to the character of the Grade II* parkland and AHLV offset by a substantial enhancement to the character and quality of the gardens. Details of hard and soft landscaping would be required to be secured by condition.

56. *Landscape (Arboriculture)* – Whilst the proposal will result in the loss of trees throughout the site, some of which are unusual species whereby retention would have preferred, the proposed planting will generally mitigate the removal in the long term. The loss of the beech tree to the north of the riding school is particularly regrettable however a structural engineers support supplied by the applicant suggests the tree should be removed as a preventative measure.
57. *Sustainable Travel* – The submitted Travel Plan (TP) does not meet the required DCC standards therefore a condition is recommended to secure this. The improvements shown to bus stop infrastructure and accessibility are welcomed and should be secured by condition.

EXTERNAL CONSULTEE RESPONSES:

58. *Northumbrian Water Limited* – At this stage have no comments to make.
59. *Police Architectural Liaison Officer* – No comments received.
60. *Visit County Durham* – This is a game-changing development for the County, and would like to express their complete support for the project. The proposer and their consultants have taken a very professional approach to establishing and understanding market demand and profiling existing and potential visitors. Unusually, the overall project is entirely consistent with all of the Durham Tourism Management Plan's destination development priorities which are;
 - Lengthen the amount of time that visitors spend in the county
 - Improve the quality of the visitor experience post arrival
 - Differentiate Durham for external audiences
 - Attract new staying visitors to the county
 - Retain existing day visitors to the county
 - Address seasonality
 - Develop new product and support existing product strengths
 - Improve SME and micro business performance

From a post-COVID recovery perspective, the proposed developments at Raby are considered critical to the future success of the county in order to aid recovery and retain or create jobs for our residents especially given the severity of the impact of the pandemic on tourism and the visitor economy.

PUBLIC RESPONSES:

61. The application has been advertised by way of a press and site notice and individual notification letters to neighbouring residents.
62. Two letters of objection have been received. It is not considered that the submission addresses the dangers and inconvenience caused for road users if more people attend the site, particularly for large scale events. It is considered that the submitted Transport Assessment includes some discrepancies and typing errors. The site is not fully accessible by sustainable transport options meaning most visitors will travel by private motor vehicle which does not address environmental considerations. Coupled with the additional (housing) development proposed in the village, it is considered that this would have an adverse cumulative impact on the highway network.

The above is not intended to repeat every point made and represents a summary of the comments received on this application. The full written text is available for inspection on the application file which can be viewed at: <https://publicaccess.durham.gov.uk/online-applications/simpleSearchResults.do?action=firstPage>

APPLICANTS STATEMENT:

63. Raby Estate is an historic landed estate within County Durham centred around Raby Castle, near Staindrop.
64. For many years the Castle and Parkland was only open to visitors on a sporadic basis, making a limited contribution to the wider County Durham tourism economy. This is changing. In 2016 the current Lord and Lady Barnard inherited Raby and now seeks to open up Raby Castle Park and Gardens ('RCPG') to create a sustainable commercial business, showcasing Raby and its values and as a place that brings together the community. This aspiration will have wide reaching positive impacts for the local community and on the tourism economy for County Durham, making one of the finest and best-preserved castle and garden sites accessible to visitors all year round. Visitor arrival arrangements have already been reorganised providing greater accessibility for visitors and local people alike.
65. This is the beginning of a new era for Raby and underpins the vision of 'Raby Rising' driving forward an enhanced tourism proposition as part of a long term sustainable proposition. That vision seeks to retain Raby's existing appeal locally and regionally whilst reaching out to new visitor audiences with an enhanced offer.
66. A masterplan has been developed to inform this work, with the aspiration being a significant increase in visitor numbers to 120,000 per annum, aligned with the Durham Tourism Management Plan. This increase will assist in financing the long-term maintenance of RCPG, as well as creating a major visitor attraction within County Durham, increasing the number of overnight stays and visitor dwell time within the County. In turn this will result in a significant increase in visitor expenditure, summarised as follows:
 - The direct impact of the development is estimated to be around £3M per annum
 - Total estimated direct, indirect and induced economic impact in the area of £8.5M per annum.
 - Average spend of £20.71 per day, creating additional spend in the local economy of around £830,000 per annum
 - Around 8,300 overnight visitors. With an average spend of £253.87 per trip creating additional spend in the local economy of around £2.1M per annum.
 - The direct impact of the development could create around 55 jobs. Using the Employment multiplier this would suggest a further 66 jobs created in the wider supply chain.
67. Developing RCPG to realise its potential as a key regional asset and national tourism destination requires considerable funding. The Castle itself is in a good state of repair due to personal investment of the Vane family, however the numerous listed buildings are in varying states of repair, requiring significant capital investment to ensure they remain viable in the future.
68. Works will include a programme of repairs and restoration to the buildings, including the repurposing of buildings to give them a long-term viable use, as well as extensive works to restore the Grade II* Walled Garden. Other commercial developments are also proposed including car parking, children's adventure play area and new build visitor arrivals building.
69. In exploring funding sources, the most appropriate means of raising the capital investment required to facilitate the heritage conservation works at RCPG is the release of land in Raby Estate's ownership at the villages of Staindrop and Gainford for

residential development. Separate planning applications have been submitted (also before Planning Committee) and funding for RCPG will be secured via legal agreement. Without the residential development, the proposals at RCPG, aligned with the significant economic benefits for the County, cannot be brought forward.

70. In summary, it is the strong view of the Estate that planning permission should be granted for this unique proposal which will secure the long-term future of RCPG a key asset for the County.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND ASSESSMENT

71. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 sets out that if regard is to be had to the development plan, decisions should be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In accordance with advice within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the policies contained therein are material considerations that should be taken into account in decision making. Other material considerations include representations received. In this context, it is considered that the main planning issues in this instance relate to: the principle of the development, locational sustainability of the site, highway safety and access, landscape and visual impact, heritage, archaeology, layout and design, amenity of adjacent land users, ecology, flooding and drainage, contamination and land stability and other considerations.

The Principle of the Development

The Development Plan

72. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF is a material planning consideration. The County Durham Plan (CDP) is the statutory development plan and the starting point for determining applications as set out in the Planning Act and reinforced at Paragraph 12 of the NPPF. The CDP was adopted in October 2020 and provides the policy framework for the County up until 2035.
73. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision taking this means:-
- c) approving development proposals that accord with an up to date development plan without delay; or
 - d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:
 - i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or,
 - ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.
74. Policy 7 of the County Durham Plan (CDP) relates to visitor attractions, outlining that the visitor sector is an important and resilient part of the county's economy. Amongst its

advice, it states that the provision of new visitor attractions, or the expansion of existing ones will be permitted provided they are; located in sustainable locations, or can be made so; appropriate to the site's location in terms of scale, design, layout and materials and; it enhances and complements existing visitor attractions or priorities in the county and supports the development of a year-round visitor economy and/or extends visitor stays. Where a countryside location is necessary the development should meet visitor needs, support local employment and community services, ensure adequate infrastructure and respect the character of the countryside. Applications for large scale new or expanding visitor attractions should be accompanied by comprehensive masterplanning and a robust business plan to articulate the potential impacts, proposed mitigation and economic, social and environmental benefits. The supporting text for the policy lists Raby Castle as one of approximately 70 regionally, nationally and internationally recognisable tourist attractions in the county benefitting from significant visitor numbers.

75. Policy 10 of the CDP relates to development in the countryside. Amongst its advice it outlines that development will only be permitted where allowed for by specific policies in the CDP, one of which is Policy 7 discussed above. Policy 10 outlines support for the change of use of an existing building or structures which already make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area and is capable of conversion without complete or substantial rebuilding, disproportionate extension or unsympathetic alterations; results in an enhancement of the building's immediate setting and in the case of a heritage asset, represents the optimal viable use of that asset consistent with their conservation.
76. Paragraph 83 of the NPPF sets out that planning decisions should enable the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings as well as encouraging sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside. Paragraph 84 recognises that some businesses may be found beyond existing settlements. In these circumstances it is important to ensure that the development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable highway impact and exploits opportunities to make the location more sustainable.
77. A masterplan and business plan has been developed in support of the applications, with the aspiration being a significant increase in visitor numbers, aligned with the Durham Tourism Management Plan, which will also assist in financing the long-term maintenance of the Castle, Park and Gardens, as well as support a major visitor attraction within County Durham. The total combined cost of the RCPG masterplan, is expected to cost in the region of £12-14m. This represents a substantial level of investment by the Estate and will result in considerable economic and tourism rated benefits, both during the construction and operational phases. It would see the expansion of an already successful visitor attraction through the development of new buildings and facilities in addition to the conversion of a number of designated heritage assets. Based on the increased visitor number projections (both day and overnight), the direct impact of the development is estimated to be around £3M arising through additional spend in the local economy. In addition to this direct expenditure there would indirect and induced economic benefits. All combined this is expected to be in the region of £8.5M. The Business Plan also estimates that the proposal could create 55 FTE jobs and a further 66 FTE jobs in the wider network.
78. Visit County Durham have offered their complete support for this proposal and consider it to be a game-changing development for the County. They consider that the overall project is entirely consistent with all of the Durham Tourism Management Plan's destination development priorities including lengthening the amount of time that visitors spend in the county, improving the quality of the visitor experience, attracting new

staying visitors and retaining day visitors to the county and addressing seasonality. Visit County Durham see this development playing a crucial part of an increasing range of key attraction investments within the county which are pivotal to the vibrance, viability and sustainability of Durham as a destination. The proposal will result in longer and more importantly overnight stays, bringing positive economic benefits for the local economy in terms of job creation and spend in the supply chain and local businesses. It also brings visitors into rural areas, optimising the potential of neighbouring market towns to attract visitors and operate as service centres for people on rural holidays.

79. In summary, whilst the proposal would draw support in principle from both Policies 7 and 10 of the CDP, the overall acceptability of the scheme or otherwise can only be considered following an examination of all of the issues and consideration of applicable policies.

Locational Sustainability of the Site

80. Policy 21 of the CDP requires all developments to deliver sustainable transport by providing appropriate, well designed, permeable and direct routes for walking, cycling and bus access, so that new developments clearly link to existing services and facilities together with existing routes for the convenience of all users. Policy 29 of the CDP requires that major development proposals provide convenient access for all users whilst prioritising the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users, people with a range of disabilities, and, emergency and service vehicles whilst ensuring that connections are made to existing cycle and pedestrian networks. Policy 7 also advises that visitor attraction development should be located in sustainable and accessible locations, or can be made so. Specifically, the NPPF sets out at Paragraphs 103, 108 and 110 that significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. Notwithstanding this, Paragraph 84 recognises that some businesses may be found beyond existing settlements in locations that are not well served by public transport. In such cases proposals should exploit opportunities to make a location more sustainable by for example improving the scope for access on foot, cycling or by public transport.
81. Bus stops lie on the A688 Keverstone Bank which provide a limited service between Barnard Castle, Bishop Auckland and Darlington, operating Mondays to Saturdays. Whilst the development would lie within the desired maximum walk of 400m to bus stops, the existing access arrangement to these bus stops and the associated infrastructure is not ideal. To improve access, Raby Estates propose a comprehensive package of works including creating an area of hardstanding to the south bound stop, clearing existing vegetation to reveal existing steps and a path to the north bound service as well as creating a new ramped access and installing dropped kerbs. It is proposed that these works would be secured by condition.
82. In order to encourage non-car modes of transport the proposed plans show a number of cycle parking facilities to cater for both visitors and employees. The delivery of these is proposed to be secured by condition.
83. The submitted Travel Plan (TP) does not meet the required DCC standards therefore a condition is recommended to secure this in the event of an approval in accordance with Policy 21 of the CDP.
84. Policy 26 of the CDP expects developments to maintain or improve the permeability of the built environment and access to the countryside for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. Paragraph 98 of the NPPF outlines that decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access including taking opportunities to provide better facilities

for users. There are no public rights of way within or immediately adjacent to the development that would be expected to be impacted by these proposals.

85. Overall, it is recognised that this is an existing visitor attraction within a rural area. It is considered that the developer has taken opportunities where possible to improve accessibility to the site through means other than the private motor car in accordance with Policies 7, 21, 26 and 29 of the CDP and Paragraphs 84, 98, 103, 108 and 110 of the NPPF.

Highway Safety and Access

86. Policy 21 of the CDP outlines that development should not be prejudicial to highway safety or have a severe cumulative impact on network capacity in addition to expecting developments to deliver well designed pedestrian routes and sufficient cycle and car parking provision. Similarly, Policy 29 advocates that convenient access is made for all users of the development together with connections to existing cycle and pedestrian routes. Policy 10 (criteria q) sets out proposals should not be prejudicial to highway safety. Specifically, the NPPF sets out at Paragraph 108 that safe and suitable access should be achieved for all people. In addition, Paragraph 109 of the NPPF states that development should only be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts on development are severe.
87. A Transport Assessment (TA) has been submitted to consider the potential highway and transport related impacts associated with this proposal and any mitigation required. The Highways Authority is satisfied with the submitted TA and the conclusions reached by the transport consultant which indicate that the proposed development, including event day traffic, will not result in severe residual cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network and therefore no mitigation is required.
88. Access and egress arrangements would remain as they are currently, with the primary access being off the A688 Keverstone Bank through North Lodge. There is a secondary access point at South Lodge, further to the south. The increased and formalised visitor parking provision is considered appropriate to accommodate the additional demand. Cycle parking provision and improved access to existing bus stops have been addressed in an earlier section of the report.
89. The Highway Authority raise no objection to the proposals. Overall, the highway impacts of the proposed development are considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policies 6, 21 and 29 of the CDP as well as Part 9 of the NPPF.

Landscape and Visual Impact

90. Policy 39 of the County Durham Plan states proposals for new development will be permitted where they would not cause unacceptable harm to the character, quality or distinctiveness of the landscape, or to important features or views. Proposals would be expected to incorporate appropriate measures to mitigate adverse landscape and visual effects. Policies 7 and 10 expect proposals to respect the character of the countryside and must not give rise to unacceptable harm to heritage or the intrinsic character, beauty or tranquillity of the countryside which cannot be adequately mitigated for. Policy 39 also sets out that development affecting Areas of Higher Landscape Value will only be permitted where it conserves the special qualities of the landscape unless the benefits of development in that location clearly outweigh the harm. Policy 26 outlines developments are expected to provide new green infrastructure and ensure provision for its long-term management and maintenance. Similar requirements are outlined in Policy 29. Policy 40 seeks to avoid the loss of existing trees and hedgerows unless suitable replacement planting is provided. Parts 12 and 15 of the NPPF promotes good

design and sets out that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by (amongst other things) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

91. The site lies in the Tees Lowlands County Character Area which forms part of the larger Tees Lowlands National Character Area (NCA23). It lies within the Northern Tees Vale: Staindrop & Ingleton Broad Character Area which belongs to the Lowland Vale Broad Landscape Type. The site lies within the parklands of Raby Castle. Part of the site is made up of a complex of ornamental and productive gardens, stables, coach house and associated buildings and spaces which sits in open parkland to the north of the castle, defined and enclosed by garden walls, tree belts and a ha-ha. The site includes an area of open parkland immediately north of this complex and a nursery plantation of conifers planted for Xmas trees to the north of that. The site lies within Raby Castle Park (Grade II*) which is identified on Historic England's Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England. Land to the west is identified as Raby Castle Estate and Designed Parkland on the County Durham Local List of Historic Parks, Gardens and Designed Landscapes (2020). The site also lies within an Area of Higher Landscape Value (AHLV). The site is not prominent in the wider landscape due to the nature of the terrain and the relatively high level of tree cover. Parts of the site are visible from a short section of the adjacent A688 near North Lodge.
92. The proposal would entail the loss of a number of trees of varying value. The rationale for tree removal is set out in the Landscape Design and Access Statement. In the majority of cases the trees are to be removed because of their poor quality and/or low life expectancy, their proximity to buildings; their impact on key historic views, or the construction of the play area, visitor centre and associated infrastructure. In some cases they are to be removed primarily to accommodate the new design of garden and other spaces. Whilst the loss of some trees, particularly the large copper beech, is regrettable the issue has been carefully considered in the design process and a balanced judgement has to be made about the removal/retention of individual trees. Having regard to the substantial landscape proposals, it is considered sufficient mitigation would take place therefore neither the Council's Arboricultural nor Landscape Officers raise any objection to this element of the scheme.
93. A new crossing of the ha-ha is proposed to access a service yard to the High Vinery. This would be a localised intervention and has been detailed in such a way as to be to be in keeping with the existing character of that boundary.
94. The Council's Landscape Officer considers that within the gardens and the ancillary areas contained within the ha-ha, the effects of the proposals would be substantial and beneficial. The re-design of the walled gardens would be respectful of their more important existing features while increasing their quality and interest. The development of the High Vinery kitchen garden into a terraced garden with restored views towards the castle would elevate a currently neglected area into an exceptionally attractive and functional garden space. The proposals for Duchess' walk would bring increased legibility and horticultural interest, the new visitor centre acting as a focus to the west. Proposals for the areas around other buildings such as the Riding School, Dutch Barn and Coach House would produce attractive and functional spaces enhancing their setting.
95. In the area north of the ha-ha, the development of a large coach and car parking area would have a more transformative and adverse impact. The visibility of the new infrastructure and parked vehicles would entail some harm in the short and medium term until hedges and tree planting were sufficiently well established to screen them. There would be some residual harm in the longer term in respect of the loss of openness in that part of the park, and the erosion of the legibility of the walled garden / stables

complex as a discrete and isolated unit within it, although the use of copses and internal tree planting will help assimilate the new parking areas in general views in a manner which is consistent with the wider character of the park. The harm is lessened to some degree by the removal of existing parking east of the gardens which is currently prominent from the principle approach.

96. The development of the play area in the north is likely to be relatively neutral in its effects. Some structures would be visible within the woodland canopy in some views. Provided that they were visually recessive and weren't allowed to become too prominent in key views of the walled gardens from the castle and its environs their impact could be relatively low and in keeping with the general character of the view. This is likely to be a dynamic situation as the plantation is young and actively growing, and play structures are likely to evolve over time.
97. Historic England have offered their support for the scheme. They consider the location for the new carpark with expanded provision is more preferable when compared to that of the existing which is more visible from the Castle and wider parkland. Boundary treatment and soft lighting would help to reduce any sense of intrusion. Whilst the Christmas tree plantation should help to screen the play area equipment it would not fully hide it so it is recommended that natural materials and recessive colours are used.
98. The Gardens Trust, whilst acknowledging the new carpark is in the most suitable location, recommend that there is additional peripheral planting to the ends of it to help better screen it. It is queried whether some elements of the play area will be seen above the tree canopies. Conditions are proposed in this regard as outlined in the following paragraph.
99. Details of hard and soft landscaping, in accordance with the principles established within the landscape masterplan, are required to be secured by condition in the event of an approval. Given the importance of some of the key mitigation measures in reducing some of the more harmful effects of the proposals it would be necessary to have them secured by condition and timescales for their delivery established. Conditions are also proposed to secure the details of the proposed play area and the future management of the plantation to ensure the development remains suitably screened within it. A sensitive lighting scheme would also be required.
100. Whilst there would be some harm arising from the development of the car park, albeit it reducing over time but with a residual element, this degree of harm upon the Grade II* Raby Castle Park would be less than substantial in itself. The overall effect of the proposals on the significance of the park would be positive. There would be no significant effects on the locally designated Raby Castle Estate and Designated Parkland. There would also be some localised harm in the short/ medium term which would be offset by greater benefits to the landscape value of the site and its contribution to the wider AHLV. Taken in the round, the effects of the proposals are considered to be beneficial, with some localised harm to the character of the park offset by a substantial enhancement to the character and quality of the gardens. The proposed development is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policies 7, 10, 26, 29, 39 40 and 44 of the CDP or Parts 12 or 15 of the NPPF.

Heritage, Archaeology, Layout and Design

101. The site is located on land immediately to the north of Raby Castle (Grade I) and is largely set within an enclosure within the open parkland defined by the ha-ha. It contains a number of listed buildings, most notably the Stables and Coach House building (Grade II*), the Dutch Barn (Grade II*), Riding School (Grade II), the Walled Gardens (Grade II) and a cistern within the Walled Gardens (Grade II) in addition to some curtilage listed

buildings such as the conservatory and vinery. Staindrop Conservation Area lies within approximately 1.2km of the southern boundary of the site with Cockfield Conservation Area some 1.5km to the north.

102. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 imposes a statutory duty that, when considering whether to grant planning permission for a development which affects a listed building or its setting, the decision maker 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. If harm is found this gives rise to a strong statutory presumption against the grant of planning permission. Any such harm must be given considerable importance and weight by the decision-maker.
103. Policy 44 of the CDP sets out development will be expected to sustain the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets, including any contribution made by their setting. Development proposals should contribute positively to the built and historic environment and should seek opportunities to enhance and, where appropriate, better reveal the significance and understanding of heritage assets whilst improving access where appropriate. The policy permits flexibility in decision-making where harm is found to the heritage assets, with a public benefit test referenced similar to that within the NPPF.
104. With regard to listed buildings specifically, Policy 44 sets out that proposals will be expected to have respect for the historic form, setting, fabric, materials, detailing, and, any other aspects including curtilage, which contribute to the significance of the building or structure; and the retention of the character and special interest of buildings when considering alternative viable uses. Policy 29 of the CDP outlines that development proposals should contribute positively to an area's character, identity, heritage significance, townscape and landscape features, helping to create and reinforce locally distinctive and sustainable communities. Parts 12 and 15 of the NPPF also seek to promote good design, while protecting and enhancing local environments. Paragraph 127 of the NPPF also states that planning decisions should aim to ensure developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit.
105. The applications are supported by detailed supporting documents many of which address heritage and design matters. Furthermore, Durham County Council's Design and Conservation Team has been working with the Estate and their appointed consultants to develop a conservation management plan (CMP) which identified the significance of the site and the capacity for change through the development of high level policies and principles. This document has been influential in shaping the current development proposals.
106. As stated previously, the Conservation Management Plan identifies the significance of the individual elements affected by this proposal and the value of the sum of the parts. This includes, buildings, structures, spaces, planting and the wider landscape. In summary, Raby Castle is one of the most significant and intact medieval Castles in the North East, set within a complete eighteenth-century deer park landscape and agricultural estate spanning much of Teesdale. Raby Castle is also significant as one of most substantial fortification sites in the county. Its completeness is of national significance, as a largely single-phase structure, with one twelfth century survival (Bulmer's Tower) and later eighteenth and nineteenth century infill and additions. The deer park associated with Raby Castle is an intact example of similar landscapes which survive nationally, and illustrates the activity of medieval nobility, which continue to have a powerful influence on English landscapes today. The landscaped parkland of the mid-eighteenth century visible at Raby Castle today is Registered as a park and garden of

special interest. The medieval Castle, Registered parkland and Walled Garden area form a highly significant group for their evidential, historical and aesthetic value. Each structure informs an understanding of its surroundings and should not be read in isolation. The landscaped park within which each structure is set is also significant, with historic routes, tree planting, designed views and ancient features all contributing to an understanding of how the Estate was used in the past.

107. The following section identifies each building, structure or landscape designation affected by the current proposals, outlines their significance, the works proposed and the impact the proposal will have on such significance. Whilst having the capacity to affect the setting of numerous designated and non-designated assets, new build development is a relatively small proportion of these proposals and is covered predominantly by the new visitor centre, the vinery café which incorporates curtilage listed structures, extensive new parking and the play and food and beverage offer to the north of the park. The design quality of these elements and their impact is also assessed in this section.

Raby Castle (Grade I)

108. One of the guiding principles in developing the current proposals was to undertake no work which would harm the setting of the castle as the principal asset. It is considered that the scheme strengthens and reinforces the visual link between the castle and the application site and reinstates some elements which have been lost from the southern slopes of the walled garden which were clearly developed to be seen and admired from certain parts of the castle complex. The relocation of the car park enhances the sense of arrival and appreciation of critical emerging and controlled views of the castle as the park is crossed. Overall, the impact on the castle, although outside the application site is considered to be wholly positive.

The Coach House and Stable Building (Grade II)*

109. The Coach House and Stable building was designed by John Carr, c1780, an architect and practice of great prestige. The structure is of high significance despite its conversion to restaurant/café, retail and WC purposes as it retains most of the original fittings. In terms of evidential value, the original plan form is largely retained, the principal modifications being allied to its evolving use for different carriages, other wheeled estate vehicles, and, at the end, motor cars, which also express historical value. This building retains much of the intended grandeur and presence in the landscape. The ochre and white limewash are bright and distinctive, of high aesthetic significance when seen from the Castle Gateway. This view, as well as those along the front of the building from the east, and from Duchess's Walk, is important. Overall, the structure is of high significance.

110. The Coach House will remain much as at present, although the emphasis of the use will change, to focus more on interpretation and education, with some supporting retail use. The alterations will comprise altering existing openings in the north wall of the centre block to facilitate connection to the Riding School and other buildings behind, and the insertion of inner glazed doors (which have already been fitted in some openings). The upper floors to the pavilions will be updated to give accommodation to visiting staff, which is a new iteration of their historic use as groom's accommodation. The Centre Block upper floor will continue in use for office and storage purposes.

111. The Coach House is largely in use and will remain very much in the same form, so the proposals focus alterations on those parts of the building which have been changed before and allow for the reversal of some earlier alterations. The alterations do not, therefore, cause harm to the significance of the buildings as they stand. They also bring

parts of the building which are currently unoccupied back into beneficial use. The impact of the current proposals are positive in terms of fabric, uses and access.

The Riding School (Grade II)

112. The Riding School building has been historically attributed to the architect John Carr, though this is not substantiated by the estate plans, nor by the architectural detailing, and a date in 1830s is more likely. As a building type, riding schools are a rarity, and the proportions of this example are unusual, being longer and narrower (and probably also less useable as a result). The principal use would have been for the exercise of horses safely and away from bad weather. Its contribution to the setting is confined to defining the northern edge of the Duchess's Walk. Aside from the renewal of the roof coverings and the enlargement of the eastern door, and minor alterations at the west end, it is as first built, which enhances its historic and aesthetic significance. Overall, the structure is of medium significance.
113. The Riding School will function as a "stone marquee", to capitalise on its character as a large bare flexible space. Some alterations are necessary to facilitate this, in view of the number of people which the building can contain. The west end door will be enlarged, and new doors created in the location of existing windows in the middle of the long north and south walls, these openings line up with those described above in the Coach House and create an essential visitor circulation route. These works will require work to the stone masonry, with some effect on the historic character of the building. It is proposed that the present earth floor be replaced with a limecrete floor, which will include trenches for the future installation of electrical and heating services, and underfloor heating to allow for future upgrading without major upheaval. Other works include the addition of folding screens east and west of the central bay of the building to allow parts of the building to be used independently for functions or for interactive visitor experiences, and for the addition of rooflights to the roof to improve natural lighting.
114. The Riding School building is currently little used and there is no realistic case for its reversion to the historic use. The works proposed will allow for sustainable uses to be identified but as a result of securing functional uses and considerable flexibility for the large space some loss of fabric and change to appearance will be required. These changes internally will all be reversible. The changes will cause less than substantial harm to the historic significance of the Riding School which will be considerably outweighed by the public benefits of increasing access to a rare building typology and securing enhancements to the building fabric.

The Dutch Barn (Grade II)*

115. The Dutch Barn is very much as first built. It is a monumental structure which reveals the high value attached to the maintenance of an equestrian establishment. Of the highest significance and particularly sensitive to change are the external elevations and ashlar sandstone masonry which forms the arcaded structure, the queen post roof trusses and the Westmorland slate coverings with ridge vents. Of high significance and also sensitive to change are the three brick ventilation stacks and the corner bollards at the west end. Of neutral significance, neither contributing to nor detracting from the significance of the whole and therefore highly adaptable are the current rainwater drainage system and earth floor.
116. This building will be improved through the removal of the later floor structures in the eastern bay, and laying a drained floor surface, to allow activities to take place in the building. It will otherwise be untouched other than the installation of lighting and power at floor and at roof level, and general repairs.

117. The architectural interventions here are minimal, and are all intended to reverse previous unsatisfactory interventions and alterations, such as the floor at the eastern end, or the wrong kind of slate used in earlier repairs, or to make the building more usable through the laying of a usable floor surface where there presently is none. It is considered that all these alterations will provide a conservation benefit and will reinforce the historic character of the building. Although light touch proposals, they will allow the building to feature in the visitor experience for the first time adding a new dimension to the understanding of the architecture of the site.

The Vinery Café (Curtilage listed)

118. This element includes repair and adaptation of historic estate garden structures with the addition of substantial newbuild elements. The remaining structure consists of a linear single-storey range of outbuildings located on the northern side of the supporting wall which backed the glasshouse that is now proposed to be replaced with the new vinery café. The range is constructed in coursed squared rubble stone with a mono-pitch slate roof with end stacks. They were associated with the gardens and glasshouses on the south side of the wall. Several openings in the wall connect the outbuilding to the former glasshouse. Internally, the linear range is divided into several rooms, which include a boiler room.

119. As a curtilage listed structure, rather than listed in its own right, the Vinery building cannot be said to possess high significance; it does however reinforce the group value of the other structures and add to the understanding of the use of the site as a whole. The idea of a Vinery in this location and forming part of the northern boundary of the site is, perhaps, more important than the actual value of the standing remains. Reflecting the spirit of the former vinery structure in these development proposals is more important to understanding than retaining the remaining fragments. Evidence of the layout and design of this area of the site is available in documentary evidence and has informed current proposals.

120. Of high significance and sensitive to change is the main wall which formed the back part of the Vinery glasshouse, its height, continuous coping, return walls with integral chimney flues at each end. Likewise, the linear character of the rear lean-to building with its mass masonry structure and robust joinery, under a slate roof is valuable. Of secondary significance are the internal layout of the rear building. The remaining whitewashed surface finish helps the understanding of the former vinery, as does the remains of the heating stove, fireplace installations and other relics. Overall, they inform the observer of garden practices and the use of heated walls in cultivation.

121. The major part of this building has been lost since 1960s, with only the linear potting shed/bothy elements behind the main heated wall surviving above ground. These will be adapted and extended to provide kitchen and toilet accommodation for visitors. The existing structural walls, roof and openings will be largely retained. Joinery will be refurbished where it survives in serviceable condition, the significant elements of fabric and layout are enhanced by these proposals. By arranging the extension to continue the linear plan of the building, harm to the understanding of this structure will be minimised. The retention of these structures is welcomed, any prospect of demolition has been resisted and responded to positively.

122. The front part of the Vinery will be entirely new, inspired by the former Vinery glasshouse. It differs in plan form from the original and rather than being linear has a projecting central section to allow for functional effective operation. A fully glazed structure was initially considered but discounted given it is south facing which would have overheated without intrusive and unsustainable mechanical ventilation. Instead it is proposed to be covered in terne coated stainless steel, which would offer some

reflectance, would be lighter in appearance than a slate roof would be and it also allows for this element to be recognised as a respectful modern addition. Some rooflights have been incorporated into the short north facing slope to bring daylight to the back of the building. The construction of the Vinery café building in this location will be beneficial because it will bring the surviving rear structures back into use; enhance the understanding of the layout and purpose of the High Garden which is thought to have been a productive rather than decorative garden through the reinstatement of a building in the historic Vinery's location, and provide essential visitor facilities to support the overall use of the site in a location near the point of arrival.

123. Associated with the implementation of this new use are the service and delivery arrangements. To access the new service yard, vehicles will pass over a new bridge across the ha-ha. Scaled and engineered to accommodate a modest delivery van, the bridge will be formed in stone, culverted to allow the continuation of the ha-ha and surfaced in tarmac (transitioning to porous tarmac in the service yard). At the point where the bridge meets the ha-ha new simple timber gates are proposed, finished in black paint. The gates will be flanked with short sections of stone walling to match the stone and coursing of the ha-ha wall. Estate railing to match that on the ha-ha wall will continue along each side of the bridge. Evergreen understorey planting in the tree belt will continue the screening effect of the gates and walls. Site investigations show that only one tree will be required to be removed to form the new bridge and service yard. This approach will ensure servicing is well contained, is essentially back of house and whilst subtle it will also introduce a new elegant structure across the ha-ha leaving a modern engineered intervention as a result. This continues the history of functional alterations in the area as practices have changed over years.

The Conservatory (Grade II listed, with the Garden Walls)

124. The conservatory and associated structures have been much changed since the date of first construction. The remaining glasshouse structure is assembled from the best parts of a larger building which had deteriorated to a point at which it had to be taken down. The supporting walls have been rebuilt to support the rebuilt central bay. The C19th plinth walls have been left in situ and additional structures placed behind to form large high planting beds, behind these are large pergolas which use the column positions of the conservatory wings. All of these works were done in c1980.
125. The proposals will return the building close to its original size, following radical reduction in 1980-81. The present pergola will be lost, and the garden walls which were altered at the same time will be returned to their former alignment. Some parts of the original mid-nineteenth conservatory survive and will be re-used in the rebuilt structure, which will be to the same design details as the original and built of painted timber. The existing potting sheds to the north of the conservatory, which are currently used as stores and mess accommodation will be re-used as kitchen and WC space to serve the proposed use of the conservatory for high class table-service catering. It is considered that these proposals, which substantially reinstate a partly lost structure of historic interest, will be a benefit and enhancement to the site with no harmful impact on its significance.

The Garden Walls and other Listed Structures (Grade II)

126. The garden walls are in general of brickwork under a stone coping. There are three sections to the garden, all facing downhill towards the south. The south wall, which runs continuously to enclose the south side of all three gardens is laid out on a curve to follow a water course, with a terrace in between. At the centre is a gateway with an ornamental stone-dressed gable over and an iron gate within. West of this is the Fig House. The east wall is offset at the northern end to accommodate the Hunting Stables with a reworked door in the south end. The west wall is similar (without the Hunting Stables),

again with a door at the south end. The gardener's cottage is built against the northern end of this wall. This cottage is listed separately at Grade II and has recently been refurbished. The north wall is of varied appearance. This may be a result of the various glasshouses which have been built against it at various times.

127. The garden walls enclose three separate gardens, arranged east west along the south facing slope. No alterations are proposed except the rebuilding of some parts at the north-west edge of the central garden, where the Conservatory is being put back and the formation of two new openings in the centre of the dividing walls between the central garden and those to each side. These openings will enable step free access to the middle of the Central garden. Whilst this alteration does harm the integrity and the completeness of the enclosure provided by the walls, the submitted information suggests that this is less than substantial harm, is partly mitigated by the works to put back parts of the wall previously cut back when the conservatory was reduced in 1980-81, and offers the public benefit of improved step-free access to the central garden, which also incorporates the most amount of historic planting. Whilst there is a loss of fabric and integrity this is considered to be a reasonable conclusion in the round.
128. There is a separately listed Lead Cistern (Grade II) in the garden, dated 1746 and brought to site from elsewhere, it is suggested around 1926. Only the front is thought to be original. It is intended that this be relocated to be above a proposed pond against the north wall of the central garden, where it will be at the head of a system of water features running down the slope. This is considered to be a more appropriate location which better reveals the significance of the structure.

The Raff Yard, Bull House and Adjoining Shed (Curtilage listed)

129. These two buildings are linked to the Stables east of the Dutch Barn and are considered to be curtilage listed. They are considered in the conservation management plan to be of low to detrimental value, with some value within the Raff Yard composition of buildings and possessing major capacity for change. It is noted that these buildings could accommodate "those services that would have an unduly harmful impact on significance elsewhere". Other buildings along the northern edge of the Raff Yard are also curtilage listed, though not directly attached to any listed building. These too present opportunities for new uses as they are considered in the CMP to have low significance and to offer major capacity for change. These buildings therefore offer capacity for change which does not affect the setting of higher status buildings adjacent.
130. The Bull House and adjoining shed are both currently used for informal storage. Externally, they have been maintained to a basic level to maintain a degree of water tightness. The Bull House abuts the stable block to the east and faces west itself, there are two black-painted windows above a top-hung sliding door on this elevation. The other external walls to this building are of rubble stone. The adjoining shed has an enclosed space behind hinged "garage" doors at the northern end, and two further open-sided bays to the south of this. Construction is squared rubble stone under a slated roof, with a hip to the northern ends and a gable to the south
131. The linear range attached to the north of the Raff Yard complex is single-storey, with mono-pitched roofs of slate, which steps down from left to right, responding to the gentle slope. There are three chimney stacks to the ridges. The range is now largely redundant and used for storage including historic carts and agricultural vehicles.
132. Following the production of an energy study for the estate and extensive debate with the LPA it was accepted that the location of buildings around Raff Yard provided the most appropriate location for support energy and heating services for the wider development. The key issue was establishing that new flues would not be unduly

prominent in approach from circulation routes. The location of the new flues to the west of the Bull House has achieved this objective. Using the buildings to the north of Raff Yard for similar purposes can also be achieved either by utilising existing flues or replicating those which exist. Raff yard had historically been a service location and these proposals continue this approach without harm to the appearance of the host buildings or the setting of those surrounding them.

Registered Park and Garden (Grade II)*

133. The application site lies entirely within the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden as designated by Historic England. The impact on this designation has been assessed in earlier sections of the report.

Raby Castle Estate & Designed Parkland - Local List of Historic Parks, Gardens and Designed Landscape

134. Raby Castle Estate and Designed Parkland is a larger area of the Castle Estate which adjoins the area contained in the statutory register in which the application site is situated. This locally listed designation is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. Where proposed works require planning permission, the significance of the locally listed site will be a 'material consideration' in determining the application. In this case it is considered that there will be no direct or indirect impact on the locally listed landscape.

Staindrop Conservation Area

135. Given the scale of the development, the distance from the conservation area, the intervening landscape and topography there will be no impact on the setting of the conservation area.

The Visitor Centre

136. The most substantial standalone newbuild intervention is the new visitor orientation centre. It contains part of a stone garden wall, which has been partially dismantled to the west of the Coach House. There is a change in ground level of some 3-400mm between the north and south sides of the wall. South of the wall, a modern glass house replaces earlier structures. The present structure is functionally useful but otherwise detrimental on aesthetic grounds, there are also other remnants of older structures which are of limited, if any significance. North of the wall the area is grassed with some bushes, forming a widening at the western end of the Duchess's Walk.

137. It is considered that this space holds limited significance within the RCPG complex and in relation to the wider Park and Estate. Since its establishment as a distinct space in the early eighteenth century, it has always been a back of house area, providing ancillary facilities to service the formal Walled Gardens. The initial CMP noted that this area represents a large space of limited significance with major potential for improvement and could accommodate the introduction of new structures if required.

138. The proposed building draws on structures on the wider estate for its form and whilst distinct, emphasises its connectedness to the Raby Estate by the choice of materials with a Westmorland slate roof and columns finished in ochre and white limewash, which will match the Coach House front elevation. A wing to the south side of the retained wall will be finished in the same wall materials though the roof will have a terne coated stainless steel finish, like the Vinery café. The glazing for the doors and windows will be to the same pattern as that to the Riding School inner doors. Overall, the new building will be recognisable as "of Raby" but will be an elegant, restrained and well detailed

modern addition which meets the architectural achievements of past generations. No harm has been identified.

Car Park

139. Impacts arising from the development have been addressed in earlier sections of report therefore comments here relate to location and impact on setting. The new car park is proposed to the north of the area enclosed by the ha-ha, thereby ending the parking of cars on the grass area to the south of the entrance drive. By no longer parking cars in this area, a key view of the castle on arrival will be greatly improved, particularly during autumn, winter and early spring when the trees along the northern edge of the cricket pitch are not in leaf.
140. The location for the new car park has been chosen to minimise its visibility from the south, and in particular from the castle. A strong tree belt and under storey planting also visually separate the car parking from the individual assets, this is further reinforced by new perimeter planting to the parking areas. Overall, the improvement to the sense of arrival by relocating car parking will be considerable and the new location chosen and the way in which this is handled will ensure there is no harm to setting.

Landscape Masterplan

141. Whilst the landscape approach has been discussed in earlier sections of the report it is considered that in a heritage context the master planning exercise has achieved an exceptionally well detailed, holistic approach to improving the spaces and linkages between the historic buildings. Hard and soft landscaping are influenced by the history of the site but will provide contemporary, engaging, high quality and discreet environments from which to enjoy the new visitor offer.

Play Area

142. The new play area facilities are proposed to be located in a plantation of spruce to the north of the proposed carpark, on the site of a former estate plant. The submitted design and access statement suggests that desire and sight lines will be carefully managed within the area so as to maximise play value yet minimise the visual and physical impact by working with the existing natural paths within the actively managed woodland and utilising the height of the trees to mask the vertical mass of the structures. Only a select few are proposed to pierce the tree line, clad in carefully selected natural materials including cedar shingles and weathered timber.
143. Two small timber buildings are proposed within this area comprising of a small-scale catering outlet and timber clad toilet. A wooded path through the carpark will lead to the existing wrought iron gates that will mark the transition into the playground over the existing swale. The gates and railings will be the subject of repair and refurbishment which will provide an additional conservation benefit.
144. These proposals utilise what is probably the only available site to accommodate such a scale of play provision without any heritage harm. Conditions would be required to secure the detailed design of this element of the proposals so as to ensure the historic environment can be adequately protected from any adverse impact.
145. Historic England support these applications. Overall, they consider that the proposals would considerably enhance the historic environment of Raby through investing in its spaces and buildings and facilitating increased appreciation of them. This is achieved in a sensitive and creative way that not only conserves but adds a new layer to the estate. The proposals are considered a good example of sustainable development as

defined within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) for the way it would increase economic activity through the sympathetic use of built and natural heritage. This is reflected in paragraph 192 of the NPPF which considers the value of heritage to economic and social well-being.

146. The Council's Design and Conservation Officer comments that these proposals offer a unique and comprehensive, once in a generation opportunity to restore and repurpose one of the most significant sections of the Raby Estate, increasing public access to the heritage and contributing to the visitor economy of the County. They consider the proposal to be exceptionally well researched, carefully considered and sensitive to the significance of each component part delivering a scheme which will leave the estate in a substantially improved position on completion. The proposals are considered to be policy compliant and any minor harm to significance is considerably outweighed by the public benefits associated with the proposals. On this basis full support is given to the approval of these applications subject to securing further detail by condition, to ensure that the promised quality is delivered.
147. Policy 44 of the CDP outlines that great weight will be given to the conservation of all designated assets and their settings. Such assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. 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 (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). 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.
148. Some minor harm to the significance of designated heritage assets has been identified as outlined earlier in the report. On balance, it is considered that any potential harm to the character, appearance and significance of the assets has been significantly reduced by the form and quality of development proposed whilst increasing public access to the buildings, securing enhancements to the building fabric and the proposals would represent the optimal viable use of the assets consistent with their conservation. In the context of the both the CDP and the NPPF, the harm to the designated heritage assets in the round is considered to be less than substantial. Whilst some less than substantial harm has been identified to some of the assets, the scheme also includes a number of positive impacts to others including the reversal of some earlier unsatisfactory interventions and alterations, introducing new iterations of historic uses and reinstating a partly lost structure of historic interest. The development proposals contribute positively to the built and historic environment, enhance and better reveal the significance and understanding of heritage assets at the same time as improving access to them. Accordingly, it is considered that the minor harm identified is outweighed by the benefits of the scheme as a whole. The proposals accord with Policy 44 of the CDP in this regard.
149. An archaeological evaluation report has been submitted in support of this application including the results of a trial trench evaluation which has confirmed the presence of remains from the former WWII camp on site. The heritage assessment which has also been submitted identifies some areas of archaeological potential. The impact of the development can be mitigated through a small excavation in the area of the car park and watching briefs to monitor works in the gardens. On the basis that conditions are imposed to secure this archaeological programme of works and reporting and achieving thereafter, the Council's Archaeologist raises no objection. The conditions also address the concerns raised by The Garden Trust who advise they will not object to the scheme provided satisfactory archaeological investigation is undertaken prior to works

commencing. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy 44 of the CDP and Paragraph 189 of the NPPF.

Amenity of Adjacent Land Users

150. Policies 29 and 31 of the CDP outline that developments should provide high standards of amenity, minimise the impact of development upon the occupants of existing adjacent and nearby properties and not lead to unacceptable levels of pollution. Parts 12 and 15 of the NPPF, require that a good standard of amenity for existing and future users be ensured, whilst seeking to prevent both new and existing development from contributing to, or being put at unacceptable risk from, unacceptable levels of pollution.
151. The development is removed from sensitive receptors, with the nearest residential properties being within RCPG and occupied by staff of the estate. It is not expected that noise or odour from the development would impact on these associated residential uses. Notwithstanding this, given the scale of the food production proposed it would be beneficial to impose a condition requiring extraction details to be agreed to allow both consideration in relation to potential impacts to amenity as well as ensuring the proposal is sensitivity designed.
152. There is the potential for disturbance during the construction period, therefore, a construction management plan should be secured to deal with construction related impacts. Subject to the imposition of such a condition and one controlling hours of working, construction related impacts could be adequately mitigated. Disruption arising during the construction process is temporary and conditions would be imposed to mitigate any significant adverse impacts.
153. Similarly, Environment, Health and Consumer Protection consider that the development will not have a significant effect on air quality and there is no requirement to undertake further assessment. They raise no objections in regard to either the operational or construction phases of the development. It is advised, in respects to the construction phase of the development, that a dust action management plan be secured by condition. As such, there would not be an adverse impact on the environment having regard to Policy 31 of the CDP and Paragraph 181 of the NPPF.
154. The proposal also includes the installation of a Combined Heat and Power (CHP) unit. The applicant is required to complete the Defra CHP Emissions screening tool to allow for consideration in terms of air quality threshold levels which will also demonstrate adherence with the Clean Air Act 1993 in relation to chimney height approval. Whilst these requirements are the subject of separate legislation, the outcome of these assessments have the potential to impact on the chimney height. Given the sensitivities of the site a condition is proposed to secure the final details of this.
155. The development would not lead to a significant reduction in the level of amenity experienced by adjacent land users, subject to appropriate conditions. Overall, the scheme would comply with Policies 29 and 31 and Parts 12 and 15 of the NPPF.

Ecology

156. Policies 26, 35, 41 and 43 of the CDP seek to secure net gains for biodiversity and coherent ecological networks. Policy 43 relates to protected species and nationally and locally protected sites. Part 15 of the NPPF seeks to ensure that developments protect and mitigate harm to biodiversity interests, and where possible, improve them.
157. An Ecological Appraisal has been submitted in support of the proposal and outlines that the development is not predicted to have any impacts on statutorily or non-statutorily

designated sites. Bat surveys identified several day roosts within a number of buildings on site as well as a maternity roost. The buildings may also support a small number of breeding birds. These species are afforded special legal protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and/or the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Opportunities also exist for roosting barn owl in some buildings although none were recorded during the bat and bird breeding surveys. Habitats within the site are also suitable for hare, hedgehog and common toad although no evidence of these species were recorded during the field survey. These are all priority species. No other protected or priority species are likely to be affected by the proposals. None of the hedgerows are important hedgerows as defined under the Hedgerows Regulations 1997.

158. Natural England has the statutory responsibility under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 to deal with any licence applications for works affecting European Protected Species. Before planning permission can be granted for development that may lead to species protected by European Law being harmed, the Local Planning Authority must apply the same derogation tests as Natural England, in order to establish if it is likely that a licence would be granted. The derogation tests are i) that the activity must be for imperative reasons of overriding public interest, or for public health and safety; ii) there must be no satisfactory alternative; iii) the favourable conservation status of the species must be maintained.
159. To compensate for the potential impacts to bats and their habitat, where possible, identified roosts will remain in situ. Mitigation will be provided in the form of bat boxes and features within the building, sensitive timing of works to avoid the hibernation period, a sensitive lighting scheme would be conditioned and remaining buildings that have no confirmed bat roosts will be undertaken to a cautionary Method Statement to address the low residential risk that bats may be present. The developer would not be able to undertake works to buildings 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 11 (as identified within the Ecological Appraisal) until obtaining the relevant Natural England Licence with all works thereafter taking place in strict accordance with the condition of the licence.
160. Having regard to the Habitats Regulations and derogation tests it is considered that i) It is in the public interest that the development scheme can be implemented to deliver associated economic, environmental and social benefits; ii) and therefore there is no satisfactory alternative in the context of this development; iii) the proposed mitigation is appropriate to ensure there will be no significant impact on the conservation of the local bat population as a whole. It is therefore considered that Natural England would be likely to grant a license. Accordingly, the LPA can discharge its duties under the Habitats Regulations.
161. The Council's Ecologist has also considered the biodiversity metric which was undertaken during the course of the application. The overall landscape strategy approach includes some limited onsite works, in addition to proposed ecological enhancement works at Laundry Clump an area within 500m of the proposed development. Overall, this would achieve a net gain of 10.7% therefore according with the policy requirements of emerging CDP and Paragraph 175 of the NPPF. A detailed habitat creation and management document, including a monitoring strategy, for a minimum of 30 years will need to be secured under Section 39 of the Wildlife and Conservation Act 1981.
162. Overall and subject to the imposition of conditions to secure the mitigation strategy, a low level lighting scheme, a detailed habitat creation and management document including a monitoring strategy for a minimum of 30 years the proposal would comply with Policies 26, 35, 41 and 43 of the CDP and Part 15 of the NPPF. The Council's Ecologist offers no objection to the scheme on this basis.

Flooding and Drainage

163. Policies 35 and 36 of the emerging CDP relate to flood water management and infrastructure. Policy 35 requires development proposals to consider the effects of the scheme on flood risk and ensure that it incorporates a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDs) to manage surface water drainage. Development should not have an adverse impact on water quality. Policy 36 seeks to ensure that suitable arrangements are made for the disposal of foul water. National advice within the NPPF and PPG with regard to flood risk advises that a sequential approach to the location of development should be taken with the objective of steering new development to flood zone 1 (areas with the lowest probability of river or sea flooding). When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere and only consider development appropriate in areas at risk of flooding where a sequential test and some instances exception test are passed, informed by a site-specific flood risk assessment.
164. The application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Strategy which highlights that the application site is within Flood Zone 1 with a low flood risk probability. The drainage strategy includes the incorporation of Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUD's) including permeable paving with some land drainage, filter drainage, gullies and rill channels. Some areas of the site will discharge to an existing channel running along the western Ha-Ha or drained via a pipe system, to the watercourse on the southern edge of the development at a restricted rate or by the use of cellular storage tanks/crate systems. Additionally, the carparks and coach park will be drained through Class 1 petrol interceptors with a downstream defender to treat surface water runoff. Drainage and Coastal Protection Officers advise that this approach would be in compliance with the Council's adopted SuDS Adoption Guide. Northumbrian Water advise that they have no comments to make. A conditional approach can be applied to secure the development takes place in accordance with the agreed scheme.
165. In relation to foul water, as there is no public foul sewer near to the site, the existing arrangements are discharged to a private septic tank. For the new flows generated by this development it is proposed to use a new foul water package plant appropriately sized to meet the new visitor requirements. As this is a major development proposal proposing the use of non-main drainage, the Environment Agency is a statutory consultee. They have assessed the submitted information and can advise they have no objection to the scheme, however, note a permit under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016 will be required. This will be brought to the developer's attention by way of an informative.
166. On this basis no objections to the development on the grounds of flood risk or drainage are raised having regards to Policies 35 and 36 of the CDP and Part 14 of the NPPF.

Contamination and Land Stability

167. Policy 32 of the CDP requires sites to be suitable for use taking into account contamination and unstable land issues. Paragraph 178 of the NPPF requires sites to be suitable for their proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination.
168. Given the sensitive end use of the site a Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment was submitted in support of the application. Environmental Health Officers agree with the conclusions within the report and that a Phase 2 site investigation is required. A condition to secure this and an informative relating to unforeseen contamination would

ensure that the site is suitable for its intended use taking account of any risks arising from contamination. The proposal would therefore accord with Policy 32 of the CDP and Paragraph 178 of the NPPF.

169. The site does not lie within the defined high risk area in relation to coal mining legacy. An informative outlining the Coal Authority's standing advice would be applied in the event of an approval. The proposal therefore complies with Policy GD1, Policy 32 of the emerging CDP and Paragraph 178 of the NPPF in demonstrating that the site is safe and stable for future development.

Other Considerations

170. Policy 29 of the CDP sets out that major new non-residential development will be required to achieve Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) minimum rating of 'very good'. Part 14 of the NPPF advises that the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future. In view of the policy wording, the requirement to achieve BREEAM standard only relates to new build elements of the scheme. The construction of the new visitor centre is the only new build element of the scheme and as the floor area falls under 1,000m² the requirements of this policy are not applicable to this application.
171. Paragraph 56 of the NPPF, and Paragraph 122 of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 set out three planning tests which must be met in order for weight to be given to a planning obligation. These being that matters specified are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, are directly related to the development, and are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. The S106 Agreement which would require the applicant to enter into a S.39 Agreement to secure the long-term management and maintenance of the biodiversity land. This obligation is considered to meet the required tests.
172. The proposal has generated limited public interest, with only two letters of objection having been received. The objections raised in relation to highways have been addressed within earlier sections of the report.
173. The objections raised during this application have been fully taken into account however ultimately the concerns raised are not felt to be of sufficient weight to justify refusal of this application in light of the benefits of the scheme and the ability to impose conditions and the requirement for the applicant to enter into an agreement under S39 of The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

CONCLUSION

174. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In light of the recent adoption of the CDP, the Council now has an up to date development plan. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision taking this means approving development proposals that accord with an up to date development plan without delay (Paragraph 11 c). The expansion of an existing visitor attraction and the conversion of existing buildings would draw support in principle from both Policies 7 and 10 of the CDP, however, the overall acceptability of the scheme or otherwise can only be considered following an examination of all of the issues and consideration of applicable policies.
175. It has been identified that there would be some harm arising from the development of the car park, albeit it reducing over time but with a residual element, with the impact to

the Grade II* Raby Castle Park being less than substantial. The overall effect of the proposals on the significance of the park would be positive. There would be no significant effects on the locally designated Raby Castle Estate and Designated Parkland. There would also be some localised harm to the AHLV in the short/ medium term which would be offset by greater benefits to the landscape value of the site and its contribution to the wider designation. Taken in the round, the effects of the proposals are considered to be beneficial, with some localised harm to the character of the park offset by a substantial enhancement to the character and quality of the gardens. Overall, the proposals are considered to be in accordance with Policies 7, 10, 26, 29, 39, 40 and 44 of the CDP and Parts 12 and 15 of the NPPF.

176. Some minor harm to the significance of designated heritage assets has been identified as outlined earlier in the report. In the context of the both the CDP and the NPPF, the harm to the designated heritage assets in the round is considered to be less than substantial. As a result, both Policy 44 of the CDP and Paragraph 196 of the NPPF advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
177. Great weight should be given to the asset's conservation and the more important the asset the greater the weight should be. This harm must be given considerable weight and importance by the decision-maker in accordance with Section 66 of the LBA and the NPPF. Whilst there will undoubtedly some alterations/loss of fabric to the Riding School and Walled Garden this harm will be considerably outweighed by the public benefits of increasing access to a rare building typology, securing enhancements to the building fabric and reinstating sections previously cut back and offering step free access. The impacts to the Grade II* Raby Castle Park have been detailed above.
178. Substantial public benefits to the historic environment would arise through increased public access to the buildings and heritage, securing enhancements to their fabric and represent the optimal viable use of the assets consistent with their conservation helping to secure their long-term future. The proposals are considered to have been exceptionally well researched, carefully considered and sensitive to the significance of each component part delivering a scheme which will leave the estate in a substantially improved position on completion.
179. The total combined cost of the RCPG masterplan, including both heritage and tourism items, is expected to cost in the region of £12 - £14m. It would result in significant economic and tourism rated benefits including job creation and additional expenditure benefits in the area.
180. To a degree the development would provide direct and indirect economic benefits within the locality and from further afield in the form of expenditure in the local economy. This would include the creation of construction jobs, as well as further indirect jobs over the lifetime of the development. A temporary economic uplift would be expected to result from the development and expenditure benefits to the area.
181. It would secure improved access to and infrastructure at the 2no. bus stops adjacent to the development which the public would benefit from as a whole.
182. Based upon the ecological works proposed, it is considered that the development should lead to 10% net gains in terms of biodiversity.
183. Overall, it is considered that the identified public benefits that would arise from the development are sufficient to outweigh the identified less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets having regards to Policy 44 of the CDP and Paragraph 196 of the NPPF.

184. Paragraph 56 of the NPPF, and Paragraph 122 of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 set out three planning tests which must be met in order for weight to be given to a planning obligation. These being that matters specified are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, are directly related to the development, and are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. The proposed obligations and contributions are considered to be in accordance with these tests.

185. The proposal has generated public interest. The objections and concerns raised have been taken into account and addressed within the report. On balance the concerns raised were not felt to be of sufficient weight to justify refusal of this application in light of the benefits of the scheme and the ability to impose conditions and secure net gains under S39 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

186. On balance, it is considered that proposals are acceptable and the application is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

That application DM/20/01183/FPA be **APPROVED** subject to the completion of a S106 Legal Agreement to secure the following:

- The requirement to enter into a Section 39 Legal Agreement to secure the long-term management and maintenance of the biodiversity land, prior to the commencement of the development.

And subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans:

Red Line Boundary Plan (Location Plan) received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 00-2000 Rev. 0 General Arrangement: As Proposed Ground Floor Plan received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 00-2001 Rev. 0 General Arrangement: As Proposed Roof Plan received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-2000 Rev. 1 Vinery Ground Floor Plan Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-2001 Rev. 1 Vinery Roof Plan Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-2100 Rev. 0 Vinery Short Section Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-2200 Rev. 0 Vinery North and South Elevations Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-2201 Rev. 0 Vinery East and West Elevations Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-5000 Rev. 0 Vinery Ground Floor Plan Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-5001 Rev. 0 Vinery Roof Plan Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-5100 Rev. 0 Vinery Short Section Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-5101 Rev. 0 Vinery Long Section Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-5100 Rev. 0 Vinery Demolition North and South Elevations received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-5101 Rev. 0 Vinery Demolition East and West Elevations received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 02-2000 Rev. 1 Visitor Centre Ground Floor Plan Proposed received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 02-2001 Rev. 1 Visitor Centre Roof Plan Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 02-2100 Rev. 0 Visitor Centre Short Section Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 02-2101 Rev. 0 Visitor Centre Long Section Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 02-2200 Rev. 0 Visitor Centre South Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 02-2201 Rev. 0 Visitor Centre North Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 02-2202 Rev. 0 Visitor Centre East Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 02-2203 Rev. 0 Visitor Centre West Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 02-2400 Rev. 0 Visitor Centre Reflected Ceiling Plan Proposed received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 02-5000 Rev. 0 Visitor Centre Ground Floor Plan Demolition received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 03-2000 Rev. 1 Coach House Ground Floor Plan Proposed received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 03-2001 Rev. 0 Coach House First Floor Plan Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 03-2002 Rev. 1 Coach House Roof Plan Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 03-2100 Rev. 0 Coach House Long Section Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 03-2101 Rev. 0 Coach House Short Section AA Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 03-2102 Rev. 0 Coach House Short Section BB Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 03-2103 Rev. 1 Coach House Short Section CC Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 03-2200 Rev. 0 Coach House South Elevations Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 03-2201 Rev. 1 Rev. 0 Coach House North Elevations Proposed received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 03-2202 Rev. 0 Coach House East and West Elevations Proposed received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 03-3100 Rev. 0 Coach House Centre Block South Internal Door Elevation
Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 03-3101 Rev. 0 Coach House Centre Block North Internal Door Elevation
Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 03-5000 Rev. 0 Coach House Ground Floor Plan Demolition received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 03-5001 Rev. 0 Coach House First Floor Plan Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 03-5002 Rev. 0 Coach House Roof Plan Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 03-5100 Rev. 0 Coach House Long Section Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 03-5101 Rev. 0 Coach House Short Section Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 03-5200 Rev. 0 Coach House South Elevations Demolition received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 03-5201 Rev. 0 Coach House North Elevations Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 03-5202 Rev. 0 Coach House East and West Elevations Demolition received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-2000 Rev. 1 Riding School Ground Floor Plan Proposed received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-2001 Rev. 1 Riding School Roof Plan Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-2100 Rev. 0 Riding School Long Section Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-2101 Rev. 1 Riding School Short Section Proposed West End received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-2102 Rev. 1 Riding School Short Section Proposed Lobby received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-2103 Rev. 1 Riding School Short Section Proposed Screen received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-2104 Rev. 0 Riding School Short Section Proposed East End received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-2200 Rev. 0 Riding School South Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-2201 Rev. 1 Riding School North Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-2202 Rev. 0 Riding School East Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-2203 Rev. 0 Riding School West Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-3100 Rev. 0 Riding School Typical New Opening Detail received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-3101 Rev. 0 Riding School East Opening Detail received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-3102 Rev. 0 Riding School West Opening Detail received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-5000 Rev. 0 Riding School Ground Floor Plan Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-5001 Rev. 0 Riding School Roof Plan Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-5100 Rev. 0 Riding School Long Section Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-5101 Rev. 0 Riding School Short Section Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-5200 Rev. 0 Riding School South Elevations Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-5201 Rev. 0 Riding School North Elevations Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-5202 Rev. 0 Riding School East Elevations Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-5203 Rev. 0 Riding School West Elevations Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-2000 Rev. 1 Dutch Barn Ground Floor Plan Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-2001 Rev. 1 Dutch Barn Roof Plan Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-2100 Rev. 0 Dutch Barn Long Section Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-2101 Rev. 0 Dutch Barn Short Section Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-2200 Rev. 0 Dutch Barn South Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-2201 Rev. 0 Dutch Barn North Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-2202 Rev. 0 Dutch Barn West Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-5000 Rev. 0 Dutch Barn Ground Floor Plan Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-5001 Rev. 0 Dutch Barn Roof Plan Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-5100 Rev. 0 Dutch Barn Long Section Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-5101 Rev. 0 Dutch Barn Short Section Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-5200 Rev. 0 Dutch Barn Elevations Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-2000 Rev. 1 Conservatory Ground Floor Plan Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-2001 Rev. 1 Conservatory Roof Plan Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-2100 Rev. 0 Conservatory Short Section Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-2200 Rev. 0 Conservatory South Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-2201 Rev. 0 Conservatory North Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-2202 Rev. 0 Conservatory East Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-2203 Rev. 0 Conservatory West Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-5000 Rev. 0 Conservatory Ground Floor Plan Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-5001 Rev. 0 Conservatory Roof Plan Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-5100 Rev. 0 Conservatory Short Section Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-5101 Rev. 0 Conservatory Long Section Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-5200 Rev. 0 Conservatory South Elevation Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-5201 Rev. 0 Conservatory North Elevation Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-5202 Rev. 0 Conservatory East Elevation Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-5203 Rev. 0 Conservatory West Elevation Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 07-2000 Rev. 1 Bull House and Shed Ground Floor Plan Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 07-2001 Rev. A Bull House and Shed Roof Plan Proposed 200 received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 07-2100 Rev. 1 Bull House and Shed Long Section Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 07-2101 Rev. 1 Bull House and Shed Bull House Sections Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 07-2102 Rev. 1 Bull House and Shed Sections Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 07-2200 Rev. 1 Bull House and Shed West Elevations Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 07-2201 Rev. 1 Bull House and Shed North Elevations Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 07-5000 Rev. 0 Bull House and Shed Ground Floor Plan Demolition received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 07-5001 Rev. 0 Bull House and Shed Roof Plan Demolition received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 07-5100 Rev. 0 Bull House and Shed Sections Demolition received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 07-5200 Rev. 0 Bull House and Shed Elevations Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 461_000_001 Rev. A Walled Garden Masterplan received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 461_010_001 Rev. A Formal Garden Plan received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 461_010_002 Rev. A Pleasure Garden Plan received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 461_010_003 Rev. A Productive Garden Plan received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 461_020_001 Rev. B Cross Sections received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 461_030_001 Rev. A New Openings in Inner Wall received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 461_030_002 Rev. A New Pergola, Formal Garden received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 461_030_003 Rev. A New Greenhouse received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 461_030_004 Rev. Green Step Detail received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. AWB118-L01 Rev. B Landscape Masterplan received 29/07/2020
Drg. no. AWB118-L06 Rev. A Trees to be retained and removed received 12/05/2020

Reason: To define the consent and ensure that a satisfactory form of development is obtained in accordance with Policies 7, 10, 21, 26, 29, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Parts 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. Development is to take place in accordance with the approved phasing plan drg. no. RRDP01 (Raby Rising Delivery Phasing Plan). For the purposes of this permission all references to a “phase” shall be interpreted as being a reference to a phase or part thereof as defined on the phasing plan pursuant to this condition.

Reason: To ensure the co-ordinated progression of the development and the provision of relevant infrastructure to each individual phase.

4. No development shall commence until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Management Plan shall include as a minimum but not necessarily be restricted to the following:
 1. A Dust Action Plan including measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction.
 2. Details of methods and means of noise reduction/suppression.

3. Where construction involves penetrative piling, details of methods for piling of foundations including measures to suppress any associated noise and vibration.
4. Details of measures to prevent mud and other such material migrating onto the highway from all vehicles entering and leaving the site.
5. Designation, layout and design of construction access and egress points.
6. Details for the provision of directional signage (on and off site).
7. Details of contractors' compounds, materials storage and other storage arrangements, including cranes and plant, equipment and related temporary infrastructure.
8. Details of provision for all site operatives for the loading and unloading of plant, machinery and materials.
9. Details of provision for all site operatives, including visitors and construction vehicles for parking and turning within the site during the construction period.
10. Routing agreements for construction traffic.
11. Details of the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate.
12. Waste audit and scheme for waste minimisation and recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works.
13. Management measures for the control of pest species as a result of demolition and/or construction works.
14. Detail of measures for liaison with the local community and procedures to deal with any complaints received.

The management strategy shall have regard to BS 5228 "Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites" during the planning and implementation of site activities and operations.

The approved Construction Management Plan shall also be adhered to throughout the construction period and the approved measures shall be retained for the duration of the construction works.

Reason: To protect the residential amenity of existing and future residents from the development in accordance with Policy 31 of the County Durham Plan and Part 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Required to be pre commencement to ensure that the whole construction phase is undertaken in an acceptable way.

5. No development shall commence until a written scheme of investigation setting out a programme of archaeological work in accordance with 'Standards for All Archaeological Work in County Durham and Darlington' has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The programme of archaeological work will then be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme of works.

Reason: To safeguard any Archaeological Interest in the site and to comply with Policy 44 of the County Durham Plan and Part 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Required to be a pre-commencement condition as the archaeological investigation/mitigation must be devised prior to the development being implemented.

6. The development shall not be occupied until the post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the approved Written Scheme of Investigation. The provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results, and archive deposition, should be confirmed in writing to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To comply with Policy 44 of the County Durham Plan and Paragraph 199 of the NPPF, which requires the developer to record and advance understanding of the significance of heritage assets, and to ensure information gathered becomes publicly accessible.

7. No development shall commence until a land contamination scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted scheme shall be compliant with the YALPAG guidance and include a Phase 2 site investigation, which shall include a sampling and analysis plan. If the Phase 2 identifies any unacceptable risks, a Phase 3 remediation strategy shall be produced and where necessary include gas protection measures and method of verification.

Reason: To ensure that the presence of contamination is identified, risk assessed and proposed remediation works are agreed in order to ensure the site is suitable for use, in accordance with Policy 32 of the County Durham Plan and Part 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Required to be pre-commencement to ensure that the development can be carried out safely.

8. Remediation works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved remediation strategy. The development shall not be brought into use until such time a Phase 4 verification report related to that part of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the remediation works are fully implemented as agreed and the site is suitable for use, in accordance with Policy 32 of the County Durham Plan and Part 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

9. No development and no works to trees shall commence until a Tree Protection Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No construction work shall take place, nor any site cabins, materials or machinery be brought on site until all trees and hedges, scheduled for retention, have been protected in accordance with the approved details and in accordance with BS 5837:2012. The protection measures shall remain in place until the cessation of the development works. The tree protection shall be retained throughout the construction period. No materials, equipment or vehicles shall be stored inside the protective fencing.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and to comply with Policy 40 of the County Durham Plan and Parts 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Required as a pre-commencement condition to ensure that the trees are adequately protected prior to the commencement of the development.

10. No development, other than site remediation works, shall commence for the relevant phase of development until the following details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

- a) Samples of all roofing materials;

- b) A sample panel of the proposed materials to be used in the construction of any external surface of the development shall be constructed on site for the inspection of an officer of the Local Planning Authority;
- c) Joinery details at a scale of 1:20 for all doors and windows;
- d) Details of all rainwater goods;
- e) Rooflight details at a scale of 1:20
- f) Details of all heads, cills and window surrounds;
- g) Details of the colour finish of all external timber work;
- h) A specification and samples of all render finishes, including colour.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and to comply with Policies 29 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Parts 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

11. No development, other than site remediation works, shall commence for the relevant phase of development until the details of the surface treatment and construction of all hard-surfaced areas have been submitted to and approved in writing the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and to comply with Policies 29 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Parts 12, 15 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

12. No development, other than site remediation works, shall commence for the relevant phase of development until details of all means of enclosure have been submitted to and approved in writing the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and to comply with Policies 29 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Parts 12, 15 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

13. No development, other than site remediation works, shall commence for the relevant phase of development until a detailed landscaping scheme, which should follow the parameters set out in drg. no. AWB118-L01 Rev. B (landscape masterplan), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any submitted scheme must be shown to comply with legislation protecting nesting birds and roosting bats. The landscape scheme shall include accurate plan based details of the following:

- Trees, hedges and shrubs scheduled for retention, including any pruning, gapping up and management works.
- Groundworks including finished levels of areas of cut and fill and specification for any imported soils and ameliorants, including details of any temporary topsoil and subsoil storage provision and any land and surface drainage.
- Hard landscaping including layout, finished levels, materials, and specifications.
- Soft landscaping including layout, planting species, planting stock sizes, densities and/or numbers.
- Planting specifications including ground preparation, tree pits, irrigation systems, plant supports and plant protection.
- Turfing, seeding and bulb or wildflower planting including specifications for cultivation, fertilisers, seed or planting mixes, and sowing or planting rates and procedures.
- Establishment maintenance, including watering, weed control, monitoring and replacement of dead, diseased or damaged plants and removal of guards, ties and stakes.

The local planning authority shall be notified in advance of the start on site date and the completion date of all external works.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity and character of the area and to comply with Policies 26, 29, 39, 40 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Part 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

14. All planting, seeding or turfing and habitat creation in the approved details of the landscaping scheme shall be carried out in accordance with a timetable to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

No tree shall be felled or hedge removed until the removal/felling is shown to comply with legislation protecting nesting birds and roosting bats.

Any trees or plants which die, fail to flourish or are removed within a period of 5 years from the substantial completion of the development shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species. Replacements will be subject to the same conditions.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity and character of the area and to comply with Policies 26, 29, 39, 40 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Part 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

15. Prior to the first use of the development hereby approved, a Travel Plan (conforming to the National Specification for Workplace Travel Plans, PAS 500:2008, Bronze level) comprising immediate, continuing or long-term measure to promote and encourage alternatives to single occupancy car use shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall include mechanisms for monitoring and review over the life of the development and timescales for implementation. The Approved Travel Plan shall thereafter be implemented, monitored and reviewed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To reduce reliance on the private motor car and to promote sustainable transport methods in accordance with Policy 21 of the County Durham Plan and Part 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

16. No development, other than site remediation works, shall commence until a scheme of works to facilitate improved access and infrastructure to the existing bus stops off the A688 Keverstone Bank adjacent to the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first use of the development.

Reason: To reduce reliance on the private motor car and to promote sustainable transport methods in accordance with Policies 21 and 29 of the County Durham Plan and Part 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

17. No development, other than site remediation works, shall commence until a scheme for cycle parking provision has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first use of the development.

Reason: To reduce reliance on the private motor car and to promote sustainable transport methods in accordance with Policies 21 and 29 of the County Durham Plan and Part 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

18. No development, other than site remediation works, shall commence until a lighting strategy for the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved strategy shall set out the overall approach to all forms of lighting within the development and will provide the parameters for detailed lighting schemes to be devised. No external lighting shall be erected within the relevant phase of development until a detailed lighting scheme has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. All external lighting shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To better reveal the significance of the historic environment, to ensure retained habitat is protected and to conserve protected species in accordance in accordance with Policies 41 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Parts 12, 15 and 16 of the NPPF.

19. No development, other than site remediation works, shall commence until a M&E strategy for the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved strategy shall set out the overall approach to all forms of mechanical and electrical installations including all service installations, ventilation, security, IT infrastructure and lighting. No works shall be undertaken within the relevant phase of development until a detailed approach for M&E installations has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the historic environment is protected in accordance in accordance with Policy 44 of the County Durham Plan and Part 16 of the NPPF.

20. No development works in relation to the provision of the Vinery Café and Conservatory shall commence until detailed submissions on the location and design of any plant, ventilation and extraction equipment for each unit shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of defining the consent, visual amenity, noise and odour issues having regards to Policies 31 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Parts 12, 15 and 16 of the NPPF.

21. Prior to the first use of the development an advertisement and signage strategy for the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved strategy shall provide the design parameters for future advertisements to be erected within the development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity having regards to Policies 29 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Parts 12 and 16 of the NPPF.

22. Prior to works commencing on the CHP unit, final details of the chimney heights shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The chimneys shall be constructed in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity having regards to Policy 44 of the County Durham Plan and Parts 12 and 16 of the NPPF.

23. Prior to works commencing on the play area (as identified by drg. no. AWB118-L01 Rev. B), a detailed scheme for the play area shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. As minimum the scheme shall include accurate plan based details of the following:

- Detailed plans, elevations and sections of the play equipment.
- Existing and proposed site levels.
- The ticketing building
- The food and beverage building.
- The toilet block.
- Tree removal and protection details.
- Details of all materials to be used.
- The requirement for any associated utilities, services and infrastructure.

The scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the play area first coming into use.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity having regards to Policies 29 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Parts 7 and 12 of the NPPF.

24. Prior to works commencing on the play area (as identified by drg. no. AWB118-L01 Rev. B), a management strategy for the plantation of spruce shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The approved strategy shall set out how the plantation will be managed so as to ensure the play structures remain visually recessive. The approved strategy shall be implemented for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure the effective management of the plantation so as to help screen the play area development in the interests of visual amenity and ensuring no adverse impact to heritage assets having regards to Policies 29, 39, 40 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Parts 7, 12, 15 and 16 of the NPPF.

25. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the drainage scheme detailed in the following documents and plans;
- Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Strategy report no. 003 (Issue 3) Wardell Armstrong dated April 2020
 - Technical Note - Job Ref NT14337/TN008 Issue 2 – 3rd August 2020
 - Technical Note Enclosures referred to in the document.
 - Technical Note, Raby Castle – Outline Maintenance Schedule Ref: NT14337/TN010 Issue 2 dated 3 August 2020
 - Technical Note, Raby Castle – Outline Method Statement Ref: NT14337/TN009 Issue 1 dated 3 August 2020
 - Appendix 1 – Ref: Car Parks Water Quality – NT14337
 - Appendix 1 – Ref: Coach Parks Water Quality – NT14337

Reason: In the interest of the adequate disposal of foul and surface water in accordance with Policies 35 and 36 of the County Durham Plan and Part 14 of the NPPF.

26. No external construction works, works of demolition, deliveries, external running of plant and equipment shall take place other than between the hours of 0730 to 1800 on Monday to Friday and 0800 to 1300 on Saturday.

No internal works audible outside the site boundary shall take place on the site other than between the hours of 0730 to 1800 on Monday to Friday and 0800 to 1700 on Saturday.

No construction works or works of demolition whatsoever, including deliveries, external running of plant and equipment, internal works whether audible or not outside the site boundary, shall take place on Sundays, Public or Bank Holidays.

For the purposes of this condition, construction works are defined as: The carrying out of any building, civil engineering or engineering construction work involving the use of plant and machinery including hand tools.

Reason: To protect the residential amenity of existing and future residents from the development in accordance with Policies 29 and 31 of the County Durham Plan and Part 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

27. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations outlined within Section G of the Ecological Appraisal Rev. R05 dated April 2020 and Section H of the Bat Survey Rev. R03 dated November 2020 by E3 Ecology Ltd.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring no protected species are affected by the development in accordance Policies 41 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Part 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

28. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the Landscape, Design and Access Statement dated April 2020 by Alastair W. Baldwin.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity and character of the area and to comply with Policies 26, 29, 39, 40 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Part 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

That application DM/20/01184/LB be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. The works to which this consent relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the consent is granted.

Reason: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans:

Red Line Boundary Plan (Location Plan) received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 00-2000 Rev. 0 General Arrangement: As Proposed Ground Floor Plan received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 00-2001 Rev. 0 General Arrangement: As Proposed Roof Plan received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-2000 Rev. 1 Vinery Ground Floor Plan Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-2001 Rev. 1 Vinery Roof Plan Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-2100 Rev. 0 Vinery Short Section Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-2200 Rev. 0 Vinery North and South Elevations Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-2201 Rev. 0 Vinery East and West Elevations Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-5000 Rev. 0 Vinery Ground Floor Plan Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-5001 Rev. 0 Vinery Roof Plan Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-5100 Rev. 0 Vinery Short Section Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-5101 Rev. 0 Vinery Long Section Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-5100 Rev. 0 Vinery Demolition North and South Elevations received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 01-5101 Rev. 0 Vinery Demolition East and West Elevations received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 02-2000 Rev. 1 Visitor Centre Ground Floor Plan Proposed received
12/05/2020
Drg. no. 02-2001 Rev. 1 Visitor Centre Roof Plan Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 02-2100 Rev. 0 Visitor Centre Short Section Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 02-2101 Rev. 0 Visitor Centre Long Section Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 02-2200 Rev. 0 Visitor Centre South Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 02-2201 Rev. 0 Visitor Centre North Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 02-2202 Rev. 0 Visitor Centre East Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 02-2203 Rev. 0 Visitor Centre West Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 02-2400 Rev. 0 Visitor Centre Reflected Ceiling Plan Proposed received
12/05/2020
Drg. no. 02-5000 Rev. 0 Visitor Centre Ground Floor Plan Demolition received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 03-2000 Rev. 1 Coach House Ground Floor Plan Proposed received
12/05/2020
Drg. no. 03-2001 Rev. 0 Coach House First Floor Plan Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 03-2002 Rev. 1 Coach House Roof Plan Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 03-2100 Rev. 0 Coach House Long Section Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 03-2101 Rev. 0 Coach House Short Section AA Proposed received
12/05/2020
Drg. no. 03-2102 Rev. 0 Coach House Short Section BB Proposed received
12/05/2020
Drg. no. 03-2103 Rev. 1 Coach House Short Section CC Proposed received
12/05/2020
Drg. no. 03-2200 Rev. 0 Coach House South Elevations Proposed received
12/05/2020
Drg. no. 03-2201 Rev. 1 Rev. 0 Coach House North Elevations Proposed received
12/05/2020
Drg. no. 03-2202 Rev. 0 Coach House East and West Elevations Proposed received
12/05/2020
Drg. no. 03-3100 Rev. 0 Coach House Centre Block South Internal Door Elevation
Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 03-3101 Rev. 0 Coach House Centre Block North Internal Door Elevation
Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 03-5000 Rev. 0 Coach House Ground Floor Plan Demolition received
12/05/2020
Drg. no. 03-5001 Rev. 0 Coach House First Floor Plan Demolition received
12/05/2020
Drg. no. 03-5002 Rev. 0 Coach House Roof Plan Demolition received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 03-5100 Rev. 0 Coach House Long Section Demolition received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 03-5101 Rev. 0 Coach House Short Section Demolition received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 03-5200 Rev. 0 Coach House South Elevations Demolition received
12/05/2020
Drg. no. 03-5201 Rev. 0 Coach House North Elevations Demolition received
12/05/2020
Drg. no. 03-5202 Rev. 0 Coach House East and West Elevations Demolition received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-2000 Rev. 1 Riding School Ground Floor Plan Proposed received
12/05/2020
Drg. no. 04-2001 Rev. 1 Riding School Roof Plan Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 04-2100 Rev. 0 Riding School Long Section Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 04-2101 Rev. 1 Riding School Short Section Proposed West End received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-2102 Rev. 1 Riding School Short Section Proposed Lobby received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-2103 Rev. 1 Riding School Short Section Proposed Screen received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-2104 Rev. 0 Riding School Short Section Proposed East End received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-2200 Rev. 0 Riding School South Elevation Proposed received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-2201 Rev. 1 Riding School North Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-2202 Rev. 0 Riding School East Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-2203 Rev. 0 Riding School West Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-3100 Rev. 0 Riding School Typical New Opening Detail received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-3101 Rev. 0 Riding School East Opening Detail received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-3102 Rev. 0 Riding School West Opening Detail received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-5000 Rev. 0 Riding School Ground Floor Plan Demolition received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-5001 Rev. 0 Riding School Roof Plan Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-5100 Rev. 0 Riding School Long Section Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-5101 Rev. 0 Riding School Short Section Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-5200 Rev. 0 Riding School South Elevations Demolition received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-5201 Rev. 0 Riding School North Elevations Demolition received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-5202 Rev. 0 Riding School East Elevations Demolition received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 04-5203 Rev. 0 Riding School West Elevations Demolition received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-2000 Rev. 1 Dutch Barn Ground Floor Plan Proposed received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-2001 Rev. 1 Dutch Barn Roof Plan Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-2100 Rev. 0 Dutch Barn Long Section Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-2101 Rev. 0 Dutch Barn Short Section Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-2200 Rev. 0 Dutch Barn South Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-2201 Rev. 0 Dutch Barn North Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-2202 Rev. 0 Dutch Barn West Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-5000 Rev. 0 Dutch Barn Ground Floor Plan Demolition received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-5001 Rev. 0 Dutch Barn Roof Plan Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-5100 Rev. 0 Dutch Barn Long Section Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-5101 Rev. 0 Dutch Barn Short Section Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 05-5200 Rev. 0 Dutch Barn Elevations Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-2000 Rev. 1 Conservatory Ground Floor Plan Proposed received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-2001 Rev. 1 Conservatory Roof Plan Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-2100 Rev. 0 Conservatory Short Section Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-2200 Rev. 0 Conservatory South Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-2201 Rev. 0 Conservatory North Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-2202 Rev. 0 Conservatory East Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-2203 Rev. 0 Conservatory West Elevation Proposed received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-5000 Rev. 0 Conservatory Ground Floor Plan Demolition received
12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-5001 Rev. 0 Conservatory Roof Plan Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-5100 Rev. 0 Conservatory Short Section Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 06-5101 Rev. 0 Conservatory Long Section Demolition received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 06-5200 Rev. 0 Conservatory South Elevation Demolition received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 06-5201 Rev. 0 Conservatory North Elevation Demolition received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 06-5202 Rev. 0 Conservatory East Elevation Demolition received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 06-5203 Rev. 0 Conservatory West Elevation Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 07-2000 Rev. 1 Bull House and Shed Ground Floor Plan Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 07-2001 Rev. A Bull House and Shed Roof Plan Proposed 200 received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 07-2100 Rev. 1 Bull House and Shed Long Section Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 07-2101 Rev. 1 Bull House and Shed Bull House Sections Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 07-2102 Rev. 1 Bull House and Shed Sections Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 07-2200 Rev. 1 Bull House and Shed West Elevations Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 07-2201 Rev. 1 Bull House and Shed North Elevations Proposed received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 07-5000 Rev. 0 Bull House and Shed Ground Floor Plan Demolition received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 07-5001 Rev. 0 Bull House and Shed Roof Plan Demolition received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 07-5100 Rev. 0 Bull House and Shed Sections Demolition received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 07-5200 Rev. 0 Bull House and Shed Elevations Demolition received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. 461_000_001 Rev. A Walled Garden Masterplan received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 461_010_001 Rev. A Formal Garden Plan received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 461_010_002 Rev. A Pleasure Garden Plan received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 461_010_003 Rev. A Productive Garden Plan received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 461_020_001 Rev. B Cross Sections received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 461_030_001 Rev. A New Openings in Inner Wall received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 461_030_002 Rev. A New Pergola, Formal Garden received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 461_030_003 Rev. A New Greenhouse received 12/05/2020
Drg. no. 461_030_004 Rev. Green Step Detail received 12/05/2020

Drg. no. AWB118-L01 Rev. B Landscape Masterplan received 29/07/2020
Drg. no. AWB118-L06 Rev. A Trees to be retained and removed received 12/05/2020

Reason: To define the consent and ensure that a satisfactory form of development is obtained in accordance with Policies 7, 10, 21, 26, 29, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Parts 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. No development, other than site remediation works, shall commence for the relevant phase of development until the following details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.
 - a) Samples of all roofing materials;

- b) A sample panel of the proposed materials to be used in the construction of any external surface of the development shall be constructed on site for the inspection of an officer of the Local Planning Authority;
- c) Joinery details at a scale of 1:20 for all doors and windows;
- d) Details of all rainwater goods;
- e) Rooflight details at a scale of 1:20
- f) Details of all heads, cills and window surrounds;
- g) Details of the colour finish of all external timber work;
- h) A specification and samples of all render finishes, including colour.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and to comply with Policies 29 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Parts 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4. No development, other than site remediation works, shall commence for the relevant phase of development until the details of the surface treatment and construction of all hard-surfaced areas have been submitted to and approved in writing the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and to comply with Policies 29 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Parts 12, 15 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 5. No development, other than site remediation works, shall commence for the relevant phase of development until details of all means of enclosure have been submitted to and approved in writing the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and to comply with Policies 29 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Parts 12, 15 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 6. No development, other than site remediation works, shall commence for the relevant phase of development until a detailed landscaping scheme, which should follow the parameters set out in drg. no. AWB118-L01 Rev. B (landscape masterplan), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any submitted scheme must be shown to comply with legislation protecting nesting birds and roosting bats. The landscape scheme shall include accurate plan based details of the following:

- Trees, hedges and shrubs scheduled for retention, including any pruning, gapping up and management works.
- Groundworks including finished levels of areas of cut and fill and specification for any imported soils and ameliorants, including details of any temporary topsoil and subsoil storage provision and any land and surface drainage.
- Hard landscaping including layout, finished levels, materials, and specifications.
- Soft landscaping including layout, planting species, planting stock sizes, densities and/or numbers.
- Planting specifications including ground preparation, tree pits, irrigation systems, plant supports and plant protection.
- Turfing, seeding and bulb or wildflower planting including specifications for cultivation, fertilisers, seed or planting mixes, and sowing or planting rates and procedures.
- Establishment maintenance, including watering, weed control, monitoring and replacement of dead, diseased or damaged plants and removal of guards, ties and stakes.

The local planning authority shall be notified in advance of the start on site date and the completion date of all external works.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity and character of the area and to comply with Policies 26, 29, 39, 40 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Part 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. No development, other than site remediation works, shall commence until a scheme for cycle parking provision has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first use of the development.

Reason: To reduce reliance on the private motor car and to promote sustainable transport methods in accordance with Policies 21 and 29 of the County Durham Plan and Part 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

8. No development, other than site remediation works, shall commence until a lighting strategy for the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved strategy shall set out the overall approach to all forms of lighting within the development and will provide the parameters for detailed lighting schemes to be devised. No external lighting shall be erected within the relevant phase of development until a detailed lighting scheme has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. All external lighting shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To better reveal the significance of the historic environment, to ensure retained habitat is protected and to conserve protected species in accordance in accordance with Policies 41 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Parts 12, 15 and 16 of the NPPF.

9. No development, other than site remediation works, shall commence until a M&E strategy for the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved strategy shall set out the overall approach to all forms of mechanical and electrical installations including all service installations, ventilation, security, IT infrastructure and lighting. No works shall be undertaken within the relevant phase of development until a detailed approach for M&E installations has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the historic environment is protected in accordance in accordance with Policy 44 of the County Durham Plan and Part 16 of the NPPF.

10. No development works in relation to the provision of the Vinery Café and Conservatory shall commence until detailed submissions on the location and design of any plant, ventilation and extraction equipment for each unit shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of defining the consent, visual amenity, noise and odour issues having regards to Policies 31 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Parts 12, 15 and 16 of the NPPF.

11. Prior to works commencing on the CHP unit, final details of the chimney heights shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The chimneys shall be constructed in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity having regards to Policy 44 of the County Durham Plan and Parts 12 and 16 of the NPPF.

12. Prior to works commencing on the play area (as identified by drg. no. AWB118-L01 Rev. B), a detailed scheme for the play area shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. As minimum the scheme shall include accurate plan based details of the following:

- Detailed plans, elevations and sections of the play equipment.
- Existing and proposed site levels.
- The ticketing building
- The food and beverage building.
- The toilet block.
- Tree removal and protection details.
- Details of all materials to be used.
- The requirement for any associated utilities, services and infrastructure.

The scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the play area first coming into use.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity having regards to Policies 29 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Parts 7 and 12 of the NPPF.

13. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the Landscape, Design and Access Statement dated April 2020 by Alastair W. Baldwin.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity and character of the area and to comply with Policies 26, 29, 39, 40 and 44 of the County Durham Plan and Part 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

STATEMENT OF PROACTIVE ENGAGEMENT

In accordance with Article 35(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, the Local Planning Authority has, without prejudice to a fair and objective assessment of the proposals, issues raised and representations received, sought to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner with the objective of delivering high quality sustainable development to improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area in accordance with the NPPF.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

- Submitted application form, plans supporting documents and subsequent information provided by the applicant.
- The National Planning Policy Framework (2019)
- National Planning Practice Guidance notes.
- County Durham Plan
- Statutory, internal and public consultation response
- Durham Tourism Management Plan (2016-2020)



Planning Services

DM/20/01183/FPA - Repurposing of existing buildings for mixed tourism, leisure and educational uses, formation of a new car park, creation of play facilities, erection of new visitor arrival building and vinery cafe, works to Walled Garden and associated infrastructure and landscaping
 DM/20/01184/LB - Refurbishment and alterations to Riding School (UID 1121778); Dutch Barn (UID 1121777); Stables and Coach House (List UID 1121776); Garden Walls (UID 1121780); and Cistern in Walled Garden (1310785)
 Raby Castle, Raby Park, Staindrop, Bishop Auckland, DL2 3AH

This map is based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of Her Majesty's Stationary Office © Crown copyright.
 Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceeding.
 Durham County Council Licence No. 100022202 2005

Comments

Date 1st December 2020

Scale Not to Scale