

Our ref: NYM/2019/0328/FL
Internal - Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
fao: Sara Robin
1 St George's Place
York
YO24 1GN
via email:

Date: 17 June 2019

This matter is being dealt with by: Miss Harriet Frank

Dear Sir/Madam

Application for conversion of attached buildings to form additional living accommodation at Northfield Granary, Suffield, Grid Reference 498675 490738

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.

Yours faithfully

Mr M Hill

Head of Development Management

Comments:

I have read the survey by Wold Ecology carried out in May 2019. The survey does not include an emergence survey but does show that the building has negligible opportunities for bat roosts, except in the roof which is not going to be impacted. The farm is however close to very high quality bat habitat with Ancient Woodland less than 500 metres away.

I would recommend that the Method Statement on page 19-22 is conditioned and that a low level lighting scheme is put in place. Works would be best undertaken between October and March as the building is not suitable for hibernating bats. If work is proposed on the roof an emergence survey will be required as there are roosting opportunities in the roof.

Sara Robin
Conservation Officer (Planning)
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
1 St George's Place
York
YO24 1GN

Website: <http://www.ywt.org.uk>

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Comments on NYM/2019/0328/FL and NYM/2019/0329/LB
Date: 17 July 2019 22:27:52

Convert attached buildings to form additional living accommodation AND listed building consent for same, both at Northfield Granary, Suffield

The above applications have been considered by Hackness 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
YO13 0HN

WARNING

This E-mail and any attachments may contain information that is confidential or privileged, and is intended solely for the use of the named recipient.
If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken is prohibited and may be unlawful.
Any opinions expressed are those of the author and not necessarily the view of the Council.

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



**LOCAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY
CONSIDERATIONS and RECOMMENDATION**

Application No: **NYM/19/328/FL**
Proposed Development: conversion of attached buildings to form additional living accommodation
Location: Northfield Granary, Suffield,
Applicant: Wilf Noble Building Supplies Ltd

CH Ref: **Case Officer:** Kay Aitchison
Area Ref: 4/1/IK **Tel:**
County Road No: **E-mail:**

To: North York Moors National Park
Authority
The Old Vicarage
Bondgate
Helmsley
YO62 5BP **Date:** 9 July 2019
FAO: Harriet Frank **Copies to:**

There are **no local highway authority objections** to the proposed development on the clear understanding that this application will be conditioned to remain ancillary to the main residence.

Signed:

Kay Aitchison

For Corporate Director for Business and Environmental Services

Issued by:

Whitby Highways Office
Discovery Way
Whitby
North Yorkshire
YO22 4PZ

e-mail:

2019_0339 & 20190/0328 Northfield Granary, Suffield

Thank you for the additional comments from the applicant in regards to these applications.

I have been through the original conversion applications (NYM/2005/0771/FL and NYM/2005/0772/LB) with the building conservation officer who was in attendance at the time and we cannot find any reference to the installation of breeze blocks into the Listed Building as part of these applications. Therefore, we would be of the view that the installation of breeze blocks constitutes unauthorised works to a Listed Building.

In regards to the current applications, we maintain our objection as per our previous comments, especially with regards to tanking, plasterboard, rooflights and rebuilding the garage in stone. However, we would like to respond to further comments made by the applicant with regards to specific aspects of the proposals:

Breeze block construction

The Structural Condition Survey report indicates that the buildings are generally in good condition (Paragraph 4.1), and makes no reference in Section 5.0 Recommendations to requirements to underpin or use breeze blocks. The addition of breeze blocks to create an interior shell to the barn is wholly unacceptable in heritage terms. Their use would result in extensive harm to the integrity of the building's character as a traditionally-built agricultural outbuilding and would result in harm to its special architectural and historical interest as a designated heritage asset. We would not be supportive of this detrimental action, which mimics a previous unauthorised scheme of works, and we note that the submitted proposed drawings do not show the introduction of breeze blocks. The NPPF paragraph 196 states that harm resulting from a development proposal should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. We do not consider that there would be any public benefits which would accrue from the proposals and hence the harm identified would be unjustified. Additionally, if the applicant raises concerns about the weight of lime plaster on the building's structural integrity (contra to the Structural Condition Survey report's findings), we would query whether the building is actually suitable for conversion as the introduction of other materials, including plasterboard etc., are likely to have a similar effect.

Plasterboard

We would also note that plasterboard and Kingspan has not yet been introduced into this part of the range, and it is not acceptable in heritage terms to do so. In addition to the concerns regarding the health of the building, plasterboard gives a smooth modern appearance and finish which is at odds with traditional forms of interior surface treatment such as lime wash or lime plaster. Thus, its introduction would again present a conflict with the historical integrity of the building's character as a traditionally-built agricultural outbuilding and would result in harm to its special architectural and historical interest as a designated heritage asset. The NPPF paragraph 196 states that harm resulting from a development proposal should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. We do not consider that there would be any public benefits which would accrue from the proposals and hence the harm identified would be unjustified.

Openings

Following on from further conversations with the applicant, we understand that it is not possible to reuse the existing openings on the adjoining wall. In regards to the addition of a ground floor opening, we could support an opening here *if* the proposed opening was of the dimensions of a standard-sized doorway and retained the returning wall nib to the north-east elevation. We are not supportive of the removal of approximately half the width of the gable wall as per Drawing # 05 or any other form of large opening. In regards to the addition of a first floor doorway, we could be supportive of a new doorway if the existing partially blocked first floor doorway, door and lintel are retained and remain visible in their current arrangement on the south side of adjoining wall as part of the proposals.

I hope these comments are helpful.

If you are minded to approve this application, please come back to me for conditions.

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Northfield Granary, Suffield, Ref NYM/2019/0328/FL
Date: 25 June 2019 16:47:40



FAO: Harriet Frank

Dear Miss Frank

Re: Northfield Granary, Suffield, Ref NYM/2019/0328/FL

Thank you for consulting us on this application. We have reviewed the documents available on your website

The building which the applicant wishes to convert appears to be in the curtilage of a Grade II-listed farmhouse Northfield Farmhouse: <https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1172831>). Is this the case?

If so, has an associated Listed Building Consent been submitted and is a Heritage Statement available.

Yours sincerely,
Lucie Carayon

Lucie Carayon
Director
Ancient Monuments Society
Registered Charity no. 209605

w: ancientmonumentsociety.org.uk
a: St Ann's Vestry Hall, 2 Church Entry, London EC4V 5HB

The Ancient Monuments Society (AMS) is one of the National Amenity Societies and, as such, is a consultee on all Listed Building Consent applications involving an element of demolition as required by the *Arrangements for handling heritage applications – notification to Historic England and National Amenity Societies and the Secretary of State (England) Direction 2015*. The Society also takes an interest in planning applications affecting historic buildings in conservation areas and undesignated heritage. We concern ourselves with historic buildings of all types and ages.

Lucie Carayon
Director
Ancient Monuments Society
Registered Charity no. 209605

w: ancientmonumentsociety.org.uk
a: St Ann's Vestry Hall, 2 Church Entry, London EC4V 5HB



Ancient Monuments Society
Defending Historic Buildings of all Ages and all Types

2019_0329 & 20190/0328 Northfield Granary, Suffield

Arranged around a courtyard achieved by incremental growth, Northfield farm dates from the early 19th century and comprises a stone-built building under pantile roof. For the avoidance of doubt, Northfield Granary is considered part of the statutory listing under section 1(5) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990 and is not “not actually listed” as stated in the Heritage & Design And Access Statement. As a whole the heritage asset exhibits various degrees of Evidential, Historical and Aesthetic values as defined by Historic England in Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance (CPPG).

Evidence submitted by the applicant in support of these applications shows the presence of a course rubble stone-built former garage under pantile, with concrete block gable wall at the eastern end. However, evidence submitted by the applicant as part of the previously approved scheme in 2005 shows a brick-built lean-to structure under modern corrugated roof. Listed Building Consent does not appear to have been granted for the rebuilding of this garage in stone under pantile and therefore we consider these works to be unauthorised works to a Listed Building. It is an offence to undertake unauthorised works to a Listed Building. Whilst a later addition to the farm complex, the brick-built building is of modest scale and character and makes a positive contribution to the significance of this designated heritage asset. The formalisation of this building into stone reduces the legibility of the historic development of the farmyard and destroys the distinctive hierarchy created through the differing architectural treatments of the outbuildings, causing harm to the designated heritage asset. We do not support its rebuilding in stone.

The desirability to preserve the significance of heritage assets, as enshrined in Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, is reflected in the NPPF. In accordance with the NPPF paragraph 193, *“when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance”*. The NPPF paragraph 194 advises that *“Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification”*.

On this occasion, whilst the principle of residential conversion is accepted we object to details of these proposals on heritage grounds. Specifically, we object to:

- creation of new openings, rather than the reuse of existing/former openings, between the barn and existing dwelling at ground and first floor;
- the introduction of rooflights to the north east elevation of the barn and former garage;
- the removal of remaining timber lintels and the introduction of concrete lintels;
- plasterboarding the interior of the barn; and,
- any form of tanking to any element of this building.

We object to proposals to introduce two new openings between the barn and existing dwelling at ground and first floor. Historical openings between the barn and the existing dwelling are visible in the extant building fabric and have Evidential and Historical values which are quite easily analysed.

Their presence provides legibility to the complex as an agricultural range, contributing to the overall significance of the heritage asset. The introduction of new openings which would remove the historical openings would diminish the readability of the range as a functionally and physically connected series of agricultural outbuildings. Furthermore, the Design Guide Part 4 states that original openings that have been blocked-up in the past should be re-used in preference to the creation of new openings. The proposed approach taken by the applicant is not considered sensitive to the special interest of the Listed Building, and would result in harm to the designated heritage asset. The NPPF paragraph 196 states that harm resulting from a development proposal should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. We do not consider that there would be any public benefits which would accrue from the proposals and hence the harm identified is unjustified. Please request the applicant to redesign the openings between the barn and the existing dwelling to incorporate and use the existing/former historical openings and retain and reuse the boarded first floor door.

We object to the introduction of three Velux rooflights on the north east elevation of the barn and the former garage. Velux rooflights in the south west elevation were approved as part of the 2005 conversion of the barn and outbuildings and it is notable that they were deliberately kept to this elevation in order to minimise the impact of rooflights on the historic and architectural character of the farm complex. The introduction of rooflights on this elevation where there are none would have a very real negative effect on the character of the Listed Building, causing harm to its significance. The NPPF paragraph 196 states that harm resulting from a development proposal should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Please request that the applicant omit any rooflights on the north east elevation of the barn and former garage. In addition, we would note that the former garage has one sizable window on the north east elevation and that proposals for half glazed double doors with side windows on the north west elevation have been included: we consider this to be adequate for lighting of an auxiliary sitting room area. However, if the proposed double doors were altered to full glazed single panels of non-reflective glass greater light will be supplied to the room negating the need for a roof light. This would better preserve the existing character of the agricultural range.

We also object to the introduction of non-traditional elements proposed as part of the stabilising works to the barn. Whilst rotten timber lintels which are not fit for purpose and cannot be repaired would need to be replaced, it should be remembered that the use of traditional timber lintels contributes to its significance as a heritage asset. Thus, replacement lintels should be in timber: we are not supportive in the introduction of concrete lintels as this has the potential to introduce new problems relating to changes in thermal conductivity and permeability of the building environment, and would have a negative effect on the character of the Listed Building. The NPPF paragraph 196 states that harm resulting from a development proposal should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. We do not consider that there would be any public benefits which would accrue from the proposals and hence the harm identified would be unjustified. Where strengthening or bracing is required, timber-to-timber or a timber-to-metal repair that involves minimum intervention should be used.

We also object to the use of plasterboard to the interior of the barn. Traditionally, agricultural buildings were not routinely plastered; however, limewash and lime plaster were sometimes used.

Plasterboard gives a smooth modern appearance and finish which is at odds with traditional forms of lime wash or lime plaster, and its use would present a conflict with the historical integrity of the building's character as a traditionally-built agricultural outbuilding. In addition, plasterboard is often installed in conjunction with impervious linings and insulations which reduce the permeability of the building. This is highly detrimental to the health of the building and its special architectural and historical interest as a designated heritage asset. The NPPF paragraph 196 states that harm resulting from a development proposal should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. We do not consider that there would be any public benefits which would accrue from the proposals and hence the harm identified would be unjustified. In order to preserve the significance of the barn as a designated heritage asset we would support the use of traditional hemp lime plaster which has insulating properties and would preserve its historical character.

Finally, we object to any form of tanking to any element of this building. The introduction of incompatible materials and methods, specifically, a liquid damp proof membrane or tanking, are harmful to the health and special historical and architectural interest of the building. By reducing the permeability and breathability of the building, the ability of the moisture to evaporate is reduced which can lead or exacerbate problems such as condensation, mould and damp- as noted by the applicant's engineer in relation to the damp proofing applied to the former garage building. This is absolutely the wrong approach to take to the alteration of a traditionally-built designated heritage asset and we will not support these works. NPPF paragraph 196 states that harm resulting from a development proposal should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. We do not consider that there would be any public benefits which would accrue from the proposals and hence the harm identified would be unjustified. We note that the engineer has suggested an alternative to tanking and proposes the excavation of the ground surface around the former garage to below the existing damp proof course. With further details, we may be able to support this option.

If you are minded to approve this application please come back to me for a list of conditions.

From: [Steve Reynolds](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Application for conversion of attached buildings to form additional living accommodation at Northfield Granary, Suffield NYM/2019/0328/FL
Date: 18 June 2019 14:55:50

FAO Harriet Frank

Application for conversion of attached buildings to form additional living accommodation at Northfield Granary, Suffield

Your ref: NYM/2019/0328/FL

I refer to your e-mail of the 17th June 2019 regarding the above application. I hereby confirm that I have no objections to the application on housing or environmental health grounds.

Thanks

Steve

Stephen Reynolds DipAc, DipEH, BSc, DMS, MSc(ENG), MCIEH, CEnvH, CMIWM
Residential Regulation Manager
Scarborough Borough Council
tel:

www.scarborough.gov.uk

DISCLAIMER

This email (and any files transmitted with it) may contain confidential or privileged information and is intended for the addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken is prohibited and may be unlawful - you should therefore return the email to the sender and delete it from your system.

For information about how we process data please see our Privacy Notice at www.scarborough.gov.uk/gdpr

Any opinions expressed are those of the author of the email, and do not necessarily reflect those of Scarborough Borough Council.

Please note: Incoming and outgoing email messages are routinely monitored for compliance with our policy on the use of electronic communications.

This email has been checked for the presence of computer viruses, but please rely on your own virus-checking procedures.

From: [Planning](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Comments on NYM/2019/0328/FL - Case Officer Miss Harriet Frank - Received from Building Conservation at The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York, YO62 5BP, via email: building@northyorkmoors.org.uk
Date: 18 June 2019 14:12:40

Please see email to the Planning Officer

Comments made by Building Conservation of The Old Vicarage

Bondgate

Helmsley

York

YO62 5BP

via email: building@northyorkmoors.org.uk

Phone:

Fax:

EMail: building@northyorkmoors.org.uk

Preferred Method of Contact is: Post

Comment Type is Object with comments

Letter ID: 524695