

From: [Planning](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Comments on NYM/2018/0730/FL - Case Officer Mrs J Bastow - Received from Building Conservation at The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York, YO62 5BP, via email: building@northyorkmoors.org.uk
Date: 02 April 2019 15:53:13

Object with comments - see email sent separately as comments too long for explorer.

Comments made by Building Conservation of The Old Vicarage

Bondgate

Helmsley

York

YO62 5BP

via email: building@northyorkmoors.org.uk

Phone: 01439 772700

Fax: 01439 770691

EMail: building@northyorkmoors.org.uk

Preferred Method of Contact is: Post

Comment Type is Object with comments

Letter ID: 517807

From: [Building](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Cc: [Jill Bastow](#); [Chris France](#); [Mark Hill](#)
Subject: Comments on NYM/2018/0730/FL have been received by the council.
Date: 02 April 2019 15:56:34

Sycamore Cottage is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset as it forms an attractive traditional and vernacular stone and slate/pantile property located in a prominent position within the centre of Ampleforth. It also falls within the Ampleforth Conservation Area wherein new development is required to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of this designated area.

The application seeks to erect a substantial two storey extension to the rear of the property following the removal of a characterful single storey extension (likely to have formerly been the wash house). The amended plans show a much reduced scheme particularly in terms of massing by setting back the first floor element with the ground floor element forming a mono-pitch outshut off the two-storey extension.

The main issues are the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider Conservation Area.

The CAAMP provides a useful overview of the character of the Conservation Area. The village is made up of predominantly stone cottages built parallel to the road where buildings tend to sit close to the pavement edge. Spaces between the buildings are therefore important by providing a relief to the stone rows and views through them. This is particularly the case with Sycamore Cottage as a result of its own drive to the side and the location of the neighbouring property, Prospect House, which is set back within its plot. As such, views through the site to the outbuildings and wooded backdrop beyond is readily visible and provides a positive feature of the Conservation Area and an attractive setting for the host property.

With regards to the scheme proposed. While the loss of the characterful single storey extension would be regrettable, it could be removed and replaced under the property's PD rights. The new extension however, would be significant in scale, extending across the whole of the rear elevation and due to its two-storey height extending from high up in the roof slope of the existing building, would be readily visible from the highway. Although slightly set down from the ridge height of the host property, its eaves height would be the same and with a minimal inset from the gable elevation would result in a large mass/bulk of stonework which would disrupt the hierarchy and sense of balance of the host building (traditionally rear extensions would be more subservient in scale and massing). Furthermore, the proposed extension by virtue of its scale, height, form and position would seriously harm the character and form of the original dwelling by totally obscuring the rear elevation. The proposed fenestration detailing also fails to respect the character of the host building.

As such, it is considered that the proposed scheme would appear as an incongruous and over-sized addition that would undermine the character of the host building, its immediate setting and the wider character and appearance of the Conservation Area. By spoiling the character of the host building and its immediate setting would diminish the positive contribution the host property makes to the Conservation Area and thus fail to preserve the character or appearance of the designated area. It is acknowledged that the works relate to the rear elevation, however the requirement for development proposals to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area applies with equal force irrespective of whether or not the proposal is prominent or available to public view.

From the plans submitted the attic space already appears to have been converted so it would be useful to understand what this space is used for – storage, third bedroom? and also the existing outbuildings appear to have been converted into domestic accommodation. Para.196 of the NPPF states that where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. No supporting statement has been provided with the application and as the building is in a good state of repair with usable rooms it is therefore considered that at this moment in time there is no public benefit to outweigh the harm caused.

We would have no objection to a traditional catslide roof, extending from below the eaves of the host property (a vernacular feature) however this wouldn't provide any first floor space. If a first floor can be justified then we would recommend that the proposed extension is reduced in footprint so that it only extends across $\frac{3}{4}$ of the

rear elevation, retaining the two traditional windows to the gable side of the main property and a substantial 'step' in eaves height. By inseting the extension by this distance, its visibility from the streetscene would be much reduced whilst enabling the character and form (particularly the rear elevation) to remain evident and also the views through the site. The resulting narrower gable would result in a more traditional style of extension more appropriate for this Conservation Area location. A single storey outshut could still be incorporated off the gable of the extension to provide the additional ground floor space. It is acknowledged that the floor space would be reduced by approx. ¼ but the resulting space would still provide sufficient level of accommodation. More traditional and subservient/less formal fenestration should also be sought to any rear extension, such as omission of formal lintols and use of horizontal sliding sashes or simple casements rather than vertical sashes.

-----Original Message-----

From: Planning

Sent: 02 April 2019 15:53

To: Building

Subject: Comments on NYM/2018/0730/FL have been received by the council.

Object with comments - see email sent seperately as comments too long for explorer.

Comments made by Building Conservation of The Old Vicarage

Bondgate

Helmsley

York

YO62 5BP

via email: building@northyorkmoors.org.uk

Phone: 01439 772700

Fax: 01439 770691

EMail: building@northyorkmoors.org.uk

Preferred Method of Contact is: Post

Comment Type is Object with comments

Letter ID: 517807

Comments are confidential.

From:
To: [Wendy Strangeway](#)
Subject: Re: NYM/2018/0730/FL - Sycamore Cottage, West End, Ampleforth
Date: 25 February 2019 13:03:22

Dear Wendy,

Following consultation with the parish councillors they have advised of the following:-

The Parish Council's original objection still stands. The Parish Council are aware of the amendments made but believe that they don't address the original concerns.

Best Regards,

Louise
Clerk - Ampleforth Parish Council

From:
To: [Wendy Strangeway](#)
Cc:
Subject: Re: NYM/2018/0730/FL - Sycamore Cottage, West End, Ampleforth
Date: 22 February 2019 08:28:49

Dear Wendy,

I confirm receipt of your email.

I am concerned that the Parish Council are only receiving details of amended plans on the 20th February when it is going to planning committee on the 28th February. Especially as the amended plans were originally only sent out by post. If the post was delayed we may never have received the amended plans before the planning committee meeting actually took place.

All planning applications, including amendments should be taken to the next available Parish Council for discussion. This includes being added to the agenda. Given the timescales applied we now have no way of being able to do this. This is against the 'open transparency' code that the Parish Council should adhere to.

I have emailed the details out to all Parish Councillors and have asked them to reply via email. As soon as I have a response I will advise. At this stage I cannot confirm whether or not the Parish Council's original objection still stands.

Best Regards,

Louise
Clerk - Ampleforth Parish Council

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Planning Application NYM/2018/0730/FL - Sycamore Cottage, Ampleforth
Date: 12 December 2018 11:55:27

Dear Planning,

Ampleforth Parish Council wish to OBJECT to the above planning application on the following grounds:-

The two storey extension will block the light from the neighbour's patio.

Best Regards,

Louise

--

From:
Mrs Louise Pink
Clerk to Ampleforth Parish Council
PO Box 824
YORK
YO31 6EA

From: [Abigail Duffy](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Cc: [Elspeth Ingleby](#)
Subject: Bat & Bird Informatives for Planning Applications 12.11.18- 18.11.18
Date: 22 November 2018 10:36:39

Hello,

If the following applications are approved, please can a **bat informative** be included;

NYM/ 2018/0730/FL- Sycamore Cottage, Ampleforth
2018/0711/FL- Hollins House, Grosmont
2018/0720/FL- 76 Main Road, Aislaby

If the following application is approved, please can a **bird informative** be included;

NYM/ 2018/0720/FL- 76 Main Road, Aislaby

Many thanks,
Abi

Abigail Duffy
Conservation Trainee
North York Moors National Park Authority
The Old Vicarage
Bondgate
Helmsley
YO62 5BP

Tel: 01439 772700
www.northyorkmoors.org.uk