

---

**From:** Building  
**Sent:** 10 January 2020 16:25  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** Kelsey Blain  
**Subject:** Comments on 3 Bloomswell, RHB - NYM/2019/0706/LB & NYM/2019/0704/FL

3 Bloomswell is located in a terrace of nine properties, all of which are Listed. The building also lies within the Robin Hood's Bay Conservation Area (itself a designated heritage asset) which is subject to an Article 4 Direction which removes domestic PD rights for certain alterations. This Direction has been in place since 2006.

3 Bloomswell is of early-mid 19 century brick construction with a pantile roof with white rendered elevations (as is the remainder of the terrace). The property has undergone some alteration with more modern casement windows but they are of timber flush fitting construction. The property also has a traditional timber panelled door and timber canopy surround both of which contributed to the special architectural and historic interest of the building and also the wider Conservation Area. A key component of the Robin Hood's Bay Conservation Area is the wide variety of traditional window types, wrought iron work, and traditional timber panelled doors, many with little wooden canopies with brass or iron door knockers and cumulatively these contribute significantly to the wider character of the Area.

As a Listed Building 3 Bloomswell is of national significance for which the LPA has a duty to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest in which it possesses, in accordance with the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The property is also located within the RHB Conservation Area for which, under the same Act, the LPA has a duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Area.

The significance of the property derives from its traditional construction, modest form and traditional detailing and its architectural style when read with the remainder of the terrace. 3 Bloomswell also has aesthetic value for its layout and sense of proportion of the internal rooms where they follow the original floor plan.

As a Listed Building the general approach to work is to adopt a repair rather than replacement approach especially where historic fabric and features of architectural or historic interest exist. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the assets conservation. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance (NPPF, 193). Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction) should require clear and convincing justification (NPPF,

194).

In terms of the impact of work which has been carried out I will comment on each part individually, however I would like to make two points with regards to the Heritage Statement. The HS refers to work being proposed which is not the case. The works have already been carried out (without the benefit of LBC and is therefore inaccurate in this respect. Further to this the heritage statement submitted with this application fails completely to grasp the significance of the site and designated heritage assets, the contribution of the site to the conservation area and the impact of the proposals to the designated heritage asset and as such is not fit for purpose as it does not meet the requirements of the NPPF (2019).

In addition, the LBC includes internal work. Access inside the building has been refused on several occasions and therefore a proper internal inspection of the work being proposed has not been able to be carried out. As such, our comments are based on the evidence and the knowledge we have of the building in question.

No objection to:

- Roof. While full replacement of the roof covering would have required LBC, on the basis that the replacement tiles are of matching handmade construction and the insulation is lamb's wool (not impermeable Kingspan) the work is acceptable.
- The reinstatement of metal rainwater goods, replacing the plastic, is supported.
- Attic. As the floorboards appear to be modern boarding, I have no objection to their replacement on a like for like basis.
- First floor floorboards. No objection to the selective approach taken to replacement and the sourcing of replacement boards to match existing on a like for like basis.
- Windows. The 'existing' windows albeit of modern casement top hung construction; they were of traditional painted timber flush fitting appearance. Their replacement with traditional sashes is supported in principle, however unfortunately the design and detailing of the new windows fail to properly reflect the local detailing found elsewhere on the terrace, namely: the use of 6 over 6 sashes rather than 8 over 8 which is more characteristic of the terrace - the result is much squarer window pane proportions which lack the elegance of the neighbouring traditional windows. The use of horns is also not characteristic of the terrace. I also wonder whether the finish is a factory 'spray' finish, rather than hand painted, which results in the flat, almost upvc like finish. Finally, with regard to the rear sash window, it would have been preferred to have use a traditional 'Whitby composite' style of window which would have more appropriately reflected the less formal characteristics of this rear elevation.

It is disappointing that the applicant had not followed formal procedures by seeking LBC prior to installation so that we could have assisted in the detail of the windows or engaged in any pre-app discussions. However, having regard to the duty of the Act to preserve the building and any features of special architectural or historic interest it is felt that, on balance, given the replacement windows are of a traditional form of fenestration in the sense that they are sashes and given they replace modern casements we would view this as a modest enhancement.

Objection is raised to the following elements:

- Ground floor damp proofing. It is acknowledged that the ground floor had been replaced with cement by a previous owner in the past (1996). However it is assumed that this procedure must have failed (which is common in traditionally constructed buildings like this) given the need to re-concrete and re-plaster the floor and walls again. Current practice to address damp in traditionally constructed buildings is now vastly different from 20+ years ago as a result of a greater understanding of how these buildings operate and in particular the need to ensure new materials are compatible with the fabric of the building especially regarding breathability. On this basis, we object to the use of gypsum and cement materials which have been, and will continue to, cause harm to the fabric of this building. The re-application of a damp proofing system requires LBC (which again has not been sought prior to carrying out the works) and as such should not be approved.
- Door. We dispute the applicant's statement that the front door is (was) a re-used internal door. Evidence of the exact same door design can be found on external doors elsewhere in the village and as such is considered to contribute to the architectural character of the Listed Building as well as the wider Conservation Area. It would be uncommon to see such a detailed panelled door internally as the majority of internal doors would be of a much simpler appearance. The replacement of the historical panelled front door with a modern machine-made door is not acceptable in heritage terms and the historical door should be reinstated. Furthermore the use of a silver/chrome door knob located centrally within the door is also harmful and fails to take account of the locally distinctive features of the village where more traditional brass or iron is the prevailing character.
- Paint colour. As a building of Georgian design the colours of the Georgian period are mainly quite 'toned-down' or 'muted' colours and early period colour schemes included earth tones such as sage green, blue-grey, browns and drabs. Later Georgian colours included soft greys, greens, sky or Wedgwood blue, beiges and stone shades, although it is unlikely that these more fashionable colours would have been that available in Robin Hood's Bay and are therefore generally less common. The colour pink therefore is not considered to be appropriate for this building and does not pay special regard to the special interest of the LB or make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area.
- Canopy and door surround. We dispute the non-historical value of the 'existing' canopy and surround claimed by the applicant as it is clearly historical. It is historical and an important architectural component of RHB houses. The list description describes the door casing as "mutilated" however it is clear from the evidence that we have that its form, design and appearance were evident and did not appear to be in poor condition. If it was in poor condition (and evidence provided to show this) a like for like replacement would have been requested. The replacement canopy and surround installed lacks the detail and fineness of the historical canopy and surround and as such we object to its replacement.
- Internal porch. We dispute the applicant's statement that the internal porch was modern. Such porches are a common feature of many of the houses and cottages in RHB and are evident in the neighbouring properties along Bloomswell. They are a locally distinctive feature of RHB and as such contribute

to the significance of this Listed Building. We object to its removal and seek its reinstatement.

In conclusion, the elements objected to above are considered to be harmful to the significance of this designated heritage asset by paying little regard to the special interest of the building or its architectural or historic significance. The loss of the porch, the door, door canopy, hardware and other alterations to the interior could, cumulatively, be considered substantial harm to a Grade II Listed Building; however it is considered to be less than substantial in this instance and as such the application fails to accord with 193, 194 and 196 of the NPPF and the Act. When a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. I see no public benefit of the proposal (and none put forward in the application).

It is also noted that the fire surround in the ground floor room has been lost. Please could the applicant provide further details as to whether anything was in situ prior to the re-plastering of the walls and also whether a new fire surround is to be installed or log burner etc.? If the fire is not to be used, then it is important that ventilation is provided into the chimney.

**From:** [Victoria Franklin](#)  
**To:** [Planning](#)  
**Subject:** Bird and Bat infromatives  
**Date:** 20 December 2019 12:48:12

---

Hello,

If the following applications are approved please can a bat informative be included in the decision notice:

NYM/2019/ 0818/FL  
0706/LB  
0830/FL

If the following applications are approved please can a bird informative be included in the decision notice:

NYM/2019/ 0823/FL

Thanks,  
Victoria

Victoria Franklin  
Graduate Conservation Trainee

North York Moors National Park  
The Old Vicarage  
Bondgate  
Helmsley  
York  
YO62 5BP

Tel: 01439772700  
[www.northyorkmoors.org.uk](http://www.northyorkmoors.org.uk)

**From:**  
**To:** [Planning](#)  
**Subject:** Fylingdales Parish Council  
**Date:** 19 December 2019 17:57:07

---

Good Afternoon,

The Council have given the following decision on applications NYM/2019/0704/FL and NYM/2019/0706/LB, 3 Bloomswell.

The Council object to these applications, the loss of original features due to the lack of consultation with pre-planning and not seeking Listed Building consent means that the building is no longer in keeping. For example the Council do not believe the pink front and rear doors are in matching styles to the originals, window details have been changed and other architectural features have now been lost.

The lack of knowledge as to if it is listed is not an acceptable excuse and respect needs to be shown for the history of the building. Since major works have taken place, number 3 Bloomswell is already looking out of keeping in a conservation area.

Kind regards,  
Steph Glasby