

**Dawn Paton**

---

**From:** Maria Calderon  
**Sent:** 08 May 2019 18:55  
**To:** Hilary Saunders  
**Cc:** Planning  
**Subject:** RE: Thirley Cotes Farm



---

**From:** Maria Calderon  
**Sent:** 08 May 2019 18:46  
**To:** Hilary Saunders  
**Cc:** Planning  
**Subject:** Thirley Cotes Farm

Hi Hilary

Please see the below comments regarding Thirley Cotes Farm.

The revised plans for Thirley Cotes Farm are largely welcomed. I have spoken with Andy Rollinson in this regard to some of the discrepancies between various documents and we were agreeable (subject to his clients approval) in the following regard.

Regarding the concrete floor that has already been laid namely; pear tree cottage, there is to be a section 6 inches wide at the base of all the walls (excluding the new stud walls). This should be applied everywhere as per the method statement and no exclude any buildings where it exists. A limecrete floor should be installed where no concrete has been laid. In this regard any concrete surfaces to be laid externally should not be bonded to the walls either, such as external terraces. All pointing and plasterwork and insulation should be done in strict accordance with the submitted method statement.

There appears to be a number of lines on the plan showing "line of level ceiling over" and "steel purlin..." these cross over into areas such as the glazed link (walnut) and rooms specified to be open such as Bedroom 1 (walnut) and associated bathroom, the bathroom to bedroom 2 (Walnut); reception (mulberry), coats (mulberry); and, bathroom to bedroom 1 (mulberry). I presume this is an oversight in the plans as David Bamford assured me in a telephone conversation (8/5/2019) that they would be open and the trusses would be better revealed. Can you please ask the applicant to submit further details in this regard or submit clarification in writing?

Correspondence with the agent indicated that William Blythe handmade tiles are to be used on the development, which are in my opinion appropriate. According to the agent this detail was to be included on the plans, but it has not. For clarity sake can you condition the roof tiles?

Regarding the trusses and their reinstatement I am happy to proceed with the proposed trusses but ask that detailed constructional drawing in the regard showing each truss be submitted for approval prior to manufacture and installation. Can you please condition this?

The stone ridge tiles should be reinstated and or replaced with natural stone, artificial stone is not acceptable. Can you condition these to be approved prior to installation?

The wall to the greenhouse both below and above has not been drawn correctly. Please see the attached photograph showing the original arrangement. This should be built as was. Can you please condition these areas of construction to be subject to further clarification and approval prior to construction? This should include provision for a stone panel to also be approved. The original heights should be reinstated and the water tabling to the west of the south range and south of the west range reinstated as before to maintain the symmetry. The steps to this area are to be as existing rather than to be reoriented as shown on plan.

The method statement covers the mix of mortar but not the finish. Can you please condition this to be subject to approval, perhaps it could be incorporated into the stone panel condition?

Earlier communication stated that the planters would be omitted but they remain on plan. I assume this is an omission. It is important that the farmyard retains the character of the farmyard, rather than becoming domestic in appearance.

I have stated on numerous occasions that a CR10 will not be permitted to the bedrooms and that CR10s were to be solely for installation within the kitchen areas as per the previous grant. However, as a compromise and in the spirit of working positively with the applicant, if they were minded to omit the CR7 to the cloaks of Mulberry, I would be minded to allow a CR10 to bedroom 3 of walnut as overall increase of glazing would on balance be negligible.

The paved area for the hot-tub to Walnut should be flush to the ground and not raised; this is in line with the previous grant.

I would also like to clarify that timber sections imbedded within the walls would remain exposed, ie the plaster coming up to them but not over, as to better reveal their significance. The contractor on site suggested to me that it was not a problem but this has failed to be shown on plan. Can you please condition that a proposal to show with timber sections would remain exposed is submitted for approval prior to plastering works?

The sectional window details for the windows, doors and glazing to the greenhouse are forthcoming; can you please condition these as subject to approval? I have already received one which was satisfactory. These should be set back in line with the usual traditional building requirements for windows.

Please also condition the gutter brackets to be subject to approval, as the manufacturers details have yet to be submitted?

I am pleased to see the retention of the cobbles and the wall plates.

Andy Rollinston, the agent for this proposal has asked that as many of the remaining minor queries be dealt with an conditions prior to construction of that element, rather than prior to the commencement of the development. In this regard I defer to you as the case officer. As long as the above matters are addressed, I consider the proposal to be satisfactory for listed building consent and planning permission.

Might I also suggest that thought be given to our dark skies in regard to the external lighting details within the development, though I accept that this is out of my remit as conservation officer.

Kind Regards

**Maria-Elena Calderón**  
**Building Conservation Officer (Planning)**  
North York Moors National Park Authority  
The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York YO62 5BP  
Telephone: 01439 772700

Working pattern: Tuesday and Wednesday

## Dawn Paton

---

**From:** Maria Calderon  
**Sent:** 08 May 2019 18:46  
**To:** Hilary Saunders  
**Cc:** Planning  
**Subject:** Thirley Cotes Farm

Hi Hilary

Please see the below comments regarding Thirley Cotes Farm.

The revised plans for Thirley Cotes Farm are largely welcomed. I have spoken with Andy Rollinson in this regard to some of the discrepancies between various documents and we were agreeable (subject to his clients approval) in the following regard.

Regarding the concrete floor that has already been laid namely; pear tree cottage, there is to be a section 6 inches wide at the base of all the walls (excluding the new stud walls). This should be applied everywhere as per the method statement and no exclude any buildings where it exists. A limecrete floor should be installed where no concrete has been laid. In this regard any concrete surfaces to be laid externally should not be bonded to the walls either, such as external terraces. All pointing and plasterwork and insulation should be done in strict accordance with the submitted method statement.

There appears to be a number of lines on the plan showing "line of level ceiling over" and "steel purlin..." these cross over into areas such as the glazed link (walnut) and rooms specified to be open such as Bedroom 1 (walnut) and associated bathroom, the bathroom to bedroom 2 (Walnut); reception (mulberry), coats (mulberry); and, bathroom to bedroom 1 (mulberry). I presume this is an oversight in the plans as David Bamford assured me in a telephone conversation (8/5/2019) that they would be open and the trusses would be better revealed. Can you please ask the applicant to submit further details in this regard or submit clarification in writing?

Correspondence with the agent indicated that William Blythe handmade tiles are to be used on the development, which are in my opinion appropriate. According to the agent this detail was to be included on the plans, but it has not. For clarity sake can you condition the roof tiles?

Regarding the trusses and their reinstatement I am happy to proceed with the proposed trusses but ask that detailed constructional drawing in the regard showing each truss be submitted for approval prior to manufacture and installation. Can you please condition this?

The stone ridge tiles should be reinstated and or replaced with natural stone, artificial stone is not acceptable. Can you condition these to be approved prior to installation?

The wall to the greenhouse both below and above has not been drawn correctly. Please see the attached photograph showing the original arrangement. This should be built as was. Can you please condition these areas of construction to be subject to further clarification and approval prior to construction? This should include provision for a stone panel to also be approved. The original heights should be reinstated and the water tabling to the west of the south range and south of the west range reinstated as before to maintain the symmetry. The steps to this area are to be as existing rather than to be reoriented as shown on plan.

The method statement covers the mix of mortar but not the finish. Can you please condition this to be subject to approval, perhaps it could be incorporated into the stone panel condition?

Earlier communication stated that the planters would be omitted but they remain on plan. I assume this is an omission. It is important that the farmyard retains the character of the farmyard, rather than becoming domestic in appearance.

I have stated on numerous occasions that a CR10 will not be permitted to the bedrooms and that CR10s were to be solely for installation within the kitchen areas as per the previous grant. However, as a compromise and in the spirit of working positively with the applicant, if they were minded to omit the CR7 to the cloaks of Mulberry, I would be minded to allow a CR10 to bedroom 3 of walnut as overall increase of glazing would on balance be negligible.

The paved area for the hot-tub to Walnut should be flush to the ground and not raised; this is in line with the previous grant.

I would also like to clarify that timber sections imbedded within the walls would remain exposed, ie the plaster coming up to them but not over, as to better reveal their significance. The contractor on site suggested to me that it was not a problem but this has failed to be shown on plan. Can you please condition that a proposal to show with timber sections would remain exposed is submitted for approval prior to plastering works?

The sectional window details for the windows, doors and glazing to the greenhouse are forthcoming; can you please condition these as subject to approval? I have already received one which was satisfactory. These should be set back in line with the usual traditional building requirements for windows.

Please also condition the gutter brackets to be subject to approval, as the manufacturers details have yet to be submitted?

I am pleased to see the retention of the cobbles and the wall plates.

Andy Rollinston, the agent for this proposal has asked that as many of the remaining minor queries be dealt with an conditions prior to construction of that element, rather than prior to the commencement of the development. In this regard I defer to you as the case officer. As long as the above matters are addressed, I consider the proposal to be satisfactory for listed building consent and planning permission.

Might I also suggest that thought be given to our dark skies in regard to the external lighting details within the development, though I accept that this is out of my remit as conservation officer.

Kind Regards

**Maria-Elena Calderón**  
**Building Conservation Officer (Planning)**  
North York Moors National Park Authority  
The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York YO62 5BP  
Telephone: 01439 772700


Working pattern: Tuesday and Wednesday

**From:** [Maria Calderon](#)  
**To:** [Hilary Saunders](#); [Planning](#)  
**Subject:** Thirley Cotes Farm NYM/2019/0101/LB and NYM/2019/0100/FL  
**Date:** 03 April 2019 18:49:06

---

In addition to my previous comments I make the following in response to the applicants email dated 29<sup>th</sup> March:

Regarding the concrete floor - the following is taken from the current Historic England guidance which is freely available at <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/eehb-insulating-solid-ground-floors/heag087-solid-floors/>



**Figure 3: Suspended timber floor replaced with uninsulated concrete slab & damp proof membrane**  
Many suspended timber floors have been removed in the past and replaced with un-insulated concrete slabs installed over a damp proof membrane. This can in some cases drive moisture into the walls that would otherwise have permeated through the floor and evaporated in the ventilated sub-floor area.

#### " 2.4 Damp-proof membranes and solid floors

*Since the Second World War a large number of suspended timber and solid ground floors in traditional buildings have been replaced with modern concrete ground-bearing floors. These well intentioned repairs were often undertaken to address problems of dampness, and utilised the standard practice in the construction of new buildings of incorporating a damp proof membrane within the floor thickness.*

*Significant historic fabric is often lost or damaged when this type of solid floor is introduced in traditional buildings. The relaying of a floor on a damp-proof membrane restricts the amount of moisture which can evaporate through the floor. The ground moisture is often displaced to the base of the walls where it can cause rising damp instead."*

As such in order to prevent any rising damp problems within the structure either a limecrete floor should be used or air airgap so that moisture is less concentrated through the walls. Although I admit this may still cause some damp issues, I was trying to find a solution that might suit us all. I accept that in the past this practice has been utilised, but it was recognised some time ago to cause problems and has not or should not have been a standard detail in traditional buildings for some time. A u-value of 0.2 could be met with 10mm wood fibre board and lime concrete floor which is well within the regulation for refurbishment. However, listed buildings are exempt from certain building regulations.

In relation to the wall lining I accept, like above that the proposed method may have been used 40 years ago as the applicant states but there are many better alternatives on the market now. For example 100mm of hemp insulation with a u-value of 0.22 and 80mm of wood fibre 0.19, would easily achieve the regulatory u-value of 0.25. Within the proposed airgap interstitial condensation can occur due the natural movement of water and the inevitable lower temperature of the external wall. This would only be exasperated by the proposed concrete floor ultimately leading to decay of the masonry wall. Furthermore the insulation and or plaster would need to be joined to the walls at some points, such as window opening and door jams so not a. Or would there be a gap between the plaster and the windows and doors? Also a breather membrane cannot breathe if it is bonded to an impermeable insulation or plaster such a gypsum and is therefore useless.

I am happy for the exposed stone walls to be lime washed as suggested, but I can the specification for this limewash be included within the forthcoming method statement or subject to approval. Futhermore these exposed walls should be ones that incorporate historic timbers set within them and be historic (not rebuilding) as to authentically portray the construction of the building. Can and additional plaster to be applied to the wall surfaces also be accounted for within this document.

Gutter brackets - we usually condition to be cast iron spike;. If they will indeed not be visible I will allow it. Can the applicant could send through a detail drawing to show how this will be constructed and not visible I would be grateful.

Regarding the roof lights there may have been some misinterpretation; for the sake of clarity the CR7s should be used everywhere, except CR10s to the kitchens of Millbury and Walnut Cottage in line with the other previous grant. I appreciate that the applicant wants to achieve as much natural light as possible; however, our policy for farm buildings DP8 clearly states that this must be minimal and our design guidance section 3 illustrates discrete roof lights. Our guidance clearly states that existing building should dictate the nature of conversation. Given the number of rooflights the applicant desires they should be small. Internal designs such as light well can maximise natural light. A CR7 for ventilation and high level internal window could provide more than sufficient light for such a small bedroom.

Concerning the concrete lintels –The traditional timber ones were removed without permission I am technically not consenting to their removal rather than asking the applicant to reinstate the timbers. As mentioned in my earlier response these were all retained as per the instruction of the Authority and the HBR report from NAA should be helpful in this regard. The use of Concrete lintels for the new openings is acceptable. This will allow a readability of the development of the building in the future. I do not accept the lifespan argument, as we are now seeing how concrete degrades, with many buildings built from concrete suffering high levels of decay. There is no

mention of concern for the lintel within the structural survey and they have survived quite well for over 100 years.

Wall ties are sometimes called wall plates, apologies for the confusion please see items 3303 in the report from NAA. Also a picture included of other examples to illustrate.



The timber from the existing trusses should be used and not made new. The existing trusses are numbered (as highlighted in the NAA report) and as such it should be easy to identify which piece of timber came from which location. The trusses are historic, not machine cut but adzed, and contain carpenter's marks which demonstrate historical construction techniques. These are deemed to be of high evidential value. Their replication is not acceptable.

The Authority agreed in principle that based on the picture submitted that a greenhouse similar in style to the Old Rectory at Pickering would be suitable. Regarding the greenhouse, yes every 4<sup>th</sup> section could be larger than the rest to support the roof. However, this should be proportionate to the scale of the building and not a complete replica of the supports for the submitted photograph as that supported a far larger building than the proposed.

Yes the pantile was discussed at a meeting with the enforcement officer and me. However, for the sake of clarity I would like the name and make of the pantile included in the application to avoid doubt. This is in line with other applications and conditions made to/set by the Authority where the pantile is confirmed in writing.

I am pleased with the detail now to be omitted and look forward to receiving the revised plans.



**From:** [Planning](#)  
**To:** [Planning](#)  
**Subject:** Comments on NYM/2019/0100/FL - Case Officer Mrs H Saunders - Received from Building Conservation at The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York, YO62 5BP, via email: [building@northyorkmoors.org.uk](mailto:building@northyorkmoors.org.uk)  
**Date:** 02 April 2019 18:46:22

---

See comments sent to [planning](#)

Comments made by Building Conservation of The Old Vicarage

Bondgate

Helmsley

York

YO62 5BP

via email: [building@northyorkmoors.org.uk](mailto:building@northyorkmoors.org.uk)

Phone: 01439 772700

Fax: 01439 770691

EMail: [building@northyorkmoors.org.uk](mailto:building@northyorkmoors.org.uk)

Preferred Method of Contact is: Post

Comment Type is Comment

Letter ID: 517309

**From:** [Maria Calderon](#)  
**To:** [Hilary Saunders](#)  
**Cc:** [Planning](#)  
**Subject:** Thirley Cotes NYM/2019/0100/FL and NYM/2019/0101/LB  
**Date:** 19 March 2019 22:49:44

---

Please see comments regarding applications NYM/2019/0100/FL and NYM/2019/0101/LB

### Thirley Cotes

The principal of conversation to the curtilage listed buildings at Thirley Cotes Farm is established through prior schemes of approval and other development within the site. Their use as holiday accommodation can be achieved without impacting upon their significance substantially. An earlier proposal achieve consent/ approval, however the applicant deviated from this and did not abide by conditions set and have subsequently submitted this new amended current application. If in my comments I refer to an earlier scheme it is to this application which I refer NYM/20180247/FL and NYM/2018/0499/LB.

The buildings are traditionally constructed with solid stone walls with earth lime mortars. The roof structure is comprised of traditional timber trusses and purlins covered with handmade pantile detailed with stone detailing. Many of the doors are traditional with stable openings attesting to earlier functions. All these details contribute positively to the special historical character of the site; embodying the agricultural essence and presenting a very strong sense of place. The buildings are located with the curtilage of a Grade II listed building and as such are considered to be a designated heritage asset. However, Development Policy 8 concerned with the conversion of traditional unlisted rural buildings is also considered with this proposal. Development Policy 8 states in point 3 that conversion will be permitted where "The building is capable of conversion and of sufficient size to accommodate the proposed use without the need for significant alterations, extensions or other new buildings". This is because traditional rural buildings make an important contribution to the quality and character of the landscape of the Park, and reflect different periods of activity and evolution of the area forming a significant part of the North York Moors National Park's cultural heritage.

I offer not objection to their conversion; but I do raise some objections and concerns to certain elements of the proposal especially in relation to their status as designated heritage assets and in line with Development Policy 8.

### General

Internally I have concerns regarding the concrete floor. In regards to mulberry cottage there is mention of visqueen to separate the concrete from the wall. However, I am not satisfied that this would be sufficient to prohibit the trapping of moisture which could cause damp and stone decay. This detail should be subject to approval. Detailed sectional drawing should be submitted that show an adequate gap between the concrete floor and historic solid walls to allow the enviable movement of moisture to occur without going through the walls.

The lining of the walls does not only harm that character of the building but the use of cavity and impermeable insulation such as kingspan should be avoided for technical purposes. This can result in localised decay and damp within the walls. The entire complex is constructed in a solid wall technique, typical of the type of building and period. As such it operates in a different manor to modern building. There are currently various breathable insulation products which could be used as an alternative to some

elevations. However, some walls should remain exposed or partially exposed (as existing) and features such as inbuilt timber also should remain exposed as to not hide their significance. The method of construction and sectional impact on reveals and jambs should be also detailed and subject to further approval.

The rainwater good should be supported by cast-iron gutter spikes not galvanised brackets. These are not considered sympathetic to the special character of the building.

There is mention of the pointing to be as detailed in the specialist method statement, but this has not been submitted with the current applications. As such please make any mortar specifications subject to approval by the authority in writing. I accept that the proposal mentions and earth lime mortar which is in principle acceptable.

In the previous scheme there was much discussion about the size of rooflights to be employed within the development and it was agreed between the applicant and the Authority that a CR7 which measures (w) 263mm x (l) 422mm is acceptable. I would find this this size of roof light acceptable (despite is being larger than the existing ones within the buildings to be developed) because they are still relatively small and should not be too intrusive to the roofscape. There is the odd exception which I will detail below.

For the sake of clarity there should be no use of concrete lintels anywhere within the property. Nor should any windows or door openings be heightened or enlarged in any way, except where permission is expressly given. The buildings are clearly all traditional and detailed thus; the only concrete being applied to the floor as a screed. Furthermore there should be not external lighting fitted to the building. This is due to the domesticating effect that they have upon the rural buildings. Any light could be achieved with down facing discrete units not attached to the buildings .

### Specific locations

#### *Pear tree cottage*

The citing of the hot tub to the front of the Pear tree cottage at the gateway to the courtyard is regretful. However, I accept that it was agreed that this area be used for recreational / outdoor space in association with pear tree cottage and as such the presence of a hot tub in this location has a negligible negative effect and so I raise no objection to this element. The lights fitted to the walls of the front and rear elevation should be omitted. Freestanding lighting to the front would be acceptable to provide light to the outdoor area. The paving to the rear over domesticates this element and should be omitted. I would raise strong objection to domesticating this elevation as not to cause harm to the character of building and this elevation in particular which faced the principal listed building and easily visible in long distance views. For these reason I also object to the scale of the proposed rooflights on this elevation, the size of which has been discussed above.

I would prefer that the application retained the wall ties to pear tree cottage which have historic character and match the other buildings.

The windows to the front elevation appear over complicated and heavy, especially with the upper openers. These should be simplified and lightweight. Please condition to be subject to approval.

All pantiles should be subject to approval in the avoidance of doubt given that there are different rooftiles within the complex.

### *Mulberry*

I have no objection to blockwork being used for the modern subdivision but where it joins the historic fabric it should not abut it too tightly and the joint be filled with lime mortar as yet to be approved.

The rooflights should be smaller and more irregularly placed ie not at right angles to one another. I have discussed the size above. However, I would allow CR10 to the kitchen area, in – line with the previous permission if this can be achieved with some degree of irregularity.

The King post- roof trusses should be reinstated and the historic form of the roof maintained. I accept that there should be a degree of compromise to allow for the bat loft. The access statement states that where possible the roof space will remain open as to be able to appreciate the character of the building. The trusses are of particular significance having high evidential value as highlighted in the applicants archaeological report.

It is regrettable that the lath and plaster ceiling has been removed from the building which is of some value. However, I am minded to accept a non-tradition insulation method to this specific location provided that the principal historic roof structure is maintained / reinstated in this regard.

### *Walnut Cottage*

From the earlier scheme a new roof light has been introduced to bedroom three. I am minded to accept this provided the rooflight to the internal corridor and new opening to the gable end is omitted.

The air source heat pump should be accessed by the corridor to the west. This would allow more of the original planform to be retained with little consequence to the applicant or flow of internal space.

The glazed link would benefit from having a lighter frame but to this I only raise concern rather than objection; as this is clearly a modern intervention that is set back from the main building.

There is no annotation to suggest that loss off, but for the sake of clarity the cobbles to the north of Walnut Cottage are historic and characterful and should be retained. The timber planters to the area should be omitted, they are not in keeping with a historic farmyard. Where troughs are present they can be utilised as planters whilst still being in keeping with a farmyard by their very definition.

Regarding the reinstatement of the wall to the south and greenhouse I believe there are still some areas that need to be amended, addressed and/or omitted in order to achieve a design that is sensitive to the building. The roof profile and the south wall should not be altered/heightened to allow for a larger space to the greenhouse area. There is no justification for such an alteration. It was agreed that a greenhouse at the location has precedence and that this could be replicated. However, it should mimic closely a historical greenhouse in materials and design and not unduly compromise the fabric of the building. The applicant (or their agents) were informed in writing sometime ago of certain characteristics of historical greenhouses that should be replicated, such as a lightweight frame and that timber sections were rarely used. As such timber sections up to 150mm wide are not acceptable and have no precedence. The pitch of roofs for historic lean-to greenhouses are usually 25 degrees or more. As such a pitch of roof of 20 degrees is not in keeping. If this does not achieve the desired space then it should be omitted from the application. The stone wall to the base should be reinstated as was. It appears that the level of the walls has changed possibly due to inconsistency or

inaccuracies with floor levels, architectural plans and external ground heights. Furthermore the return of the wall has been omitted but should be reinstated. The stone wall should be accurately reinstated in all regards. For the sake of clarity a stone panel showing the coursing, stone and joint finished should be subject to approval prior to reinstatement.

### Conclusion

The NPPF (2019) states that any harm or loss of significance to a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. Where the harm is deemed to be less than substantial harm this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Although there is some merit in bringing the building into use it is noted that they are not considered at risk and that the structural survey indicated that the buildings are in good conditions. As such it is considered that there is no public benefit in the proposal. The significance of the heritage asset is not adequately addressed in the heritage statement. However, regardless of the heritage statement the current proposed scheme is not in keeping with the local policy (as discussed above), which is a shame given the availability of design guidance available in this regard. I therefore object to this proposal on the grounds that it harms the character of the designated heritage asset, and is contra to the NPPF (2019) and current Development Policy 8 which seeks to avoid this. However, I do not object to the principle of conversion, provided it is more sensitive to the character of the traditional farmstead, in line with policy and design guidance and duly considers the objections and concerns raised above.

Our ref: NYM/2019/0100/FL  
Internal - Yorkshire Wildlife Trust  
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust  
fao: Sara Robin  
1 St George's Place  
York  
YO24 1GN

Date: 21 February 2019

This matter is being dealt with by: Mrs H Saunders

Dear Sir/Madam

**Application for conversion of and extension to redundant buildings to form 3 no. holiday cottages with associated parking, amenity spaces and landscaping works (revised scheme to NYM/2018/0247/FL) (part retrospective) at Thirley Cotes Farm, Waite Lane, Harwood Dale, Grid Reference 497659 495103**

I have received the above application. The details including forms, supporting information and plans for the application are available under the application reference number on the Authority's website using the following link:

<http://planning.northyorkmoors.org.uk/Northgate/PlanningExplorer/ApplicationSearch.aspx> and by following the instructions given.

Should you wish to view the electronic file at the Authority's offices, please call to make an appointment between the hours of 9am and 5pm Monday to Friday.

If you are being consulted by email please allow 24 hours for these plans to be made available.

I would be grateful for any comments you may have on this application within 21 days of the date of this letter.

**If you wish to extend the period in which to submit your comments or have any queries on this application please contact the Planning Officer named above**

**who is dealing with the matter.** You may reply by letter, fax, email

([planning@northyorkmoors.org.uk](mailto:planning@northyorkmoors.org.uk)) or by using the Authority's online consultation response form.

Yours faithfully

Mr M Hill

Head of Development Management

**Comment:**

A European Protected Species Licence has been issued for the works which were proposed for NYM/2018/0247/FL and all relevant surveys have been carried out. It is therefore essential that permission is provided to finish the works which will provide mitigation for the destroyed bat roosts as soon as possible. Bats will come out of hibernation during April so alternative roosts are essential, particularly as a maternity roost will be lost due to the building works. The high quality well connected habitat and the large number of bat roosts at Thirley Cotes Farm mean that the area is important for bats and replacement roosts are very important.

I have spoken to Chris Toohey of Wold Ecology who carried out the surveys and obtained the EPSL. Chris says that the first bat loft mainly needs a ceiling to be installed in the coach house which had already been reroofed so this should not be a problem. The second bat loft nearer to the farm house could be provided by partially reroofing the building to beyond where the bat loft will be and then sealing that part of the roof. Chris also said that the suggested bat boxes to mitigate for the smaller day roosts could be placed on other buildings or trees if necessary and he can advise on that as well as the bat lofts.

**As long as the replacement bat lofts are in place by the time specified in the method statement, presumably mid to late April 2019 when bats will be active, there should be no impact on bat populations.**

Sara Robin  
Conservation Officer (Planning)  
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

1 St George's Place  
York  
YO24 1GN

**NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL  
BUSINESS and ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES**



**LOCAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY  
CONSIDERATIONS and RECOMMENDATION**

**Application No:** **NYM19/100/FL**

**Proposed Development:** Conversion of and extension to redundant buildings to form 3 no. holiday cottages with associated parking, amenity spaces and landscaping works (revised scheme to NYM/2018/0247/FL) (part retrospective)

**Location:** Thirley Cotes Farm, Waite Lane, Harwood Dale,

**Applicant:** P & G Durbing Properties

**CH Ref:** **Case Officer:** Kay Aitchison

**Area Ref:** 4/26/41M **Tel:**

**County Road No:** **E-mail:**

**To:** North York Moors National Park  
Authority  
The Old Vicarage  
Bondgate  
Helmsley  
YO62 5BP **Date:** 8 March 2019

**FAO:** Hilary Saunders **Copies to:**

Holiday letting properties tend to require more parking provision than a similar permanent residential dwelling, although the off street parking shown is appropriate for a permanent residential dwelling. This holiday letting complex is located some distance from the highway boundary along a private drive, with space available to provide additional parking if required. It is not anticipated that parking will spill out onto the highway.

There are **no local highway authority objections** to the proposed development

**Signed:**

**Issued by:**

Whitby Highways Office  
Discovery Way  
Whitby  
North Yorkshire  
YO22 4PZ

*For Corporate Director for Business and Environmental Services*

**e-mail:**



**From:**  
**To:** [Planning](#)  
**Subject:** Comments on NYM/2019/0100/FL and NYM/2019/0101/LB  
**Date:** 10 March 2019 15:01:39

---

**Convert/extend redundant building to form 3 holiday cottages with parking, amenity spaces & landscaping (revised scheme to NYM/2018/0247/FL) AND Listed Building consent for internal & external alterations to redundant buildings to enable use as 3 holiday cottages (revised scheme to NYM/2018/0499/LB) both at Thirley Cotes Farm, Harwood Dale.**

The above applications have been considered by Hackness & Harwood Dale Group Parish Council and no objections are offered.

--

J Marley (Mrs)  
Clerk to Hackness and Harwood Dale Group Parish Council  
(comprising the parishes of Broxa cum Troutsdale, Darncombe cum Langdale End, Hackness, Harwood Dale, Silpho, and Suffield cum Everley).

Annan,  
41 Scalby Road,  
Burniston,  
Scarborough

**From:**  
**To:** [Planning](#)  
**Subject:** Thirley Cotes Farm, Waite Lane, Harwood Dale, Scarborough, YO13 0DR  
**Date:** 21 February 2019 13:04:08

---

**Your ref: NYM/2019/0100/FL**

**Our ref: 19/00495/PSH451**

**Proposal: Application for conversion of and extension to redundant buildings to form 3 no. holiday cottages with associated parking, amenity spaces and landscaping works (revised scheme to NYM/2018/0247/FL) (part retrospective)**

**Address: Thirley Cotes Farm, Waite Lane, Harwood Dale, Scarborough, YO13 0DR**

With reference to the above planning consultation to form 3 no holiday cottages, I confirm that we have no objections from a housing perspective.

Regards,

Stephanie Baines  
Technical Officer (Residential Regulation Team)  
Scarborough Borough Council

**From:**  
**To:** [Planning](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Thirley Cotes Farm, Waite Lane, Harwood Dale, - NYM/2019/0100/FL  
**Date:** 21 February 2019 11:15:28  
**Attachments:**

---

FAO: Mrs H Saunders,

Thank you for consultation letter. Despite the agent ticking "Main Sewer" for foul drainage then goes on to say using existing drainage system, from the submitted plans, foul water is actually draining to a private klargester treatment plant system. On this basis, no observation comments are required from Yorkshire Water.

Kind regards

Jim McGlade  
Planning Assistant  
Land Use Planning