NYMNPA 26/08/2020

## DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

#### TOFTA FARM, STAINTONDALE

Tofta Farm was originally a working farm but over the years the majority of land was sold off leaving the house, original buildings and approximately 7 acres of land.



Two of the buildings were subsequently converted to holiday accommodation and the proposal is now to convert the last remaining traditional building to provide additional holiday accommodation. To achieve this however, it is necessary to relocate the adjacent steel portal steel building to another location on the site.

The main house has retained many original features however, the owners are now seeking to renovate the property up to a modern standard including a front and rear extension. The scheme has been designed both sympathetically to the original dwelling and to compliment the style of the surrounding area.





NYMNPA

26/08/2020



# Bat, Breeding Bird and Barn Owl Scoping Survey Tofta Farm, Staintondale

May 2020

MAB Environment & Ecology Ltd 11a Kirkgate, Thirsk, North Yorkshire, YO7 1PQ

www.mab-ecology.co.uk

Registered in the UK, No.6504129 Registered office: The Old Chapel, Knayton, Thirsk YO7 4AZ

Author	Sarah Emerson Grad CIEEM		
Status	Date	Checked by:	
Final	14-05-20	Ione Bareau MCIEEM	

#### Site:

Tofta Farm Staintondale Scarborough YO13 0EB

#### Dates:

Scoping survey: 4<sup>th</sup> May 2020

**Client**: Caroline and Darren Dobson

#### Client's agent:

Eric Matthew

#### Planning Authority:

Scarborough Borough Council

Our ref:

2020-866

## **Table of Contents**

1 Summary	5
2 Introduction	6
3 Methodology	7
3.1 Desktop Study	7
3.2 Field Survey	7
4 Constraints	8
5 Site Description	9
6 Results	9
6.1 Desktop Study	9
6.2 Visual Inspection	11
7 Discussion and Analysis	13
8 Impact Assessment	14
9 Mitigation & Compensation	14
9.1 Mitigation Summary	14
9.2 Method Statement	15
10 Information concerning bat protection and the planning system	16
10.1 Relevant Legislation	16
10.2 Licences	17
10.3 Planning and Wildlife	17
11 References	20
Appendix 1: Glossary of bat roost terms	21

#### **1** Summary

A bat, breeding bird and barn owl scoping survey was undertaken on a stone outbuilding and attached modern barn at Tofta Farm, Staintondale, to accompany a planning application for the conversion of the building to a holiday let.

Very low potential bat roost habitat, suitable for crevice dwelling bat species, such as pipistrelles, was identified in Building 1. Access is limited to a small opening under the lowest course of tiles on the western aspect, which leads to the space between the liner and tiles. No evidence of bats was identified below, or within the crevice itself which would indicate use.

We can rule out any use of the buildings by bat species which require a covered void to fly in, including by maternity use. Internal conditions were undisturbed and dry, and there was dense cobwebbing within the internal roofs which are optimal for the preservation of bat droppings and feeding remains. We would expect to find bat droppings within the voids should a maternity roost be present on site.

The current proposals do not, however, involve any alterations to the roof, roof liner, or potential access crevice. Therefore, no further survey work is considered necessary at present. Should the proposed plans change, and works to the roof is required, further advice from an ecologist should be sought and a bat activity survey should be completed to determine presence/absence prior to these works commencing.

Building 2 is of negligible value for roosting bats, generally due to the construction materials used, and lack of suitable crevices.

There is no evidence of the use of the site by barn owls, and there was no evidence of breeding birds within either building.

#### **2** Introduction

MAB Environment and Ecology Ltd was commissioned by Eric Matthew on behalf of Caroline and Darren Dobson to undertake a bat, breeding bird and barn owl scoping survey on a traditional and an attached modern outbuilding at Tofta Farm, Staintondale to accompany a planning application for conversion in to a holiday let.

The site is located approximately 800m west of the village of Staintondale (Central grid reference: SE 982 984). The location of the site is shown on Figure 1 below.

The report was written by Sarah Emerson Grad CIEEM of MAB Environment and Ecology Ltd.

The report's primary objective is to provide an impact assessment for the development on bats, define any necessary mitigation proposals, and to assess the requirement for a Protected Species Licence. A secondary objective is to assess potential impact on breeding birds.



Figure 1: Site location.

#### **3 Methodology**

#### 3.1 Desktop Study

3.1.1 Bat roost records for a 2km radius around the site were commissioned from the North Yorkshire Bat Group (NYBG).

3.1.2 Aerial imagery from Google Earth and 'MAGIC' government website were used to assess the location of the site and the surrounding habitat for value to bats. This includes proximity of the site to good bat foraging habitat such as woodland and water bodies and if the site is linked to such habitats by linear features like hedgerows, woodland edges or rivers which bats use to commute around the environment.

#### 3.2 Field Survey

3.2.1 The site was surveyed by Sarah Emerson Grad CIEEM who has worked as an ecologist since 2015 and for MAB since 2017. She holds a Class Survey Licence WML-A34 (Bat Survey Level 2) registration number: 2016-26716-CLS-CLS. She also holds a Class Survey Licence for Great Crested Newts WML-CL09 (level 2) registration number 2016-19358-CLS-CLS. The surveys were carried out in accordance with the Bat Conservation Trust, Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3<sup>rd</sup> edn).

3.2.2 The exterior of the buildings were inspected during the day using halogen torches (500,000 candle power), binoculars, ladders, and a flexible endoscope (a Sea Snake LCD inspection scope). All normal signs of bat use were looked for, including bats, bat droppings, feeding waste, entry and exit holes, grease marks, dead bats, and the sounds / smells of bat roosts.

3.2.3 All signs of breeding bird activity and barn owl (*Tyto alba*) activity were looked for. Signs looked for included white droppings, often vertical down walls or beams; active nests and nesting materials; (birds flying into and out of barns: generally, summer only); bird feathers, particularly swift (*Apus apus*), swallow (*Hirundo rustica*) and house martin (*Delichon urbica*), bird corpses, feeding waste (including pellets), and the sound/smell of birds.

3.2.4 Trees within the site and areas of vegetation were also assessed for value to bats and their importance as foraging and commuting habitat.

3.2.5 The buildings were assessed for their degree of potential to support roosting bats. This includes assessing the building design, materials and condition. See Table 1 for more information.

Colour code	Suitability.	Roosting habitats	Commuting and foraging habitats
Grey	Negligible risk	Negligible habitat features on site likely to be used by roosting bats.	Negligible habitat features on site likely to be used by commuting or foraging bats.
Yellow	Low risk	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by individual bats opportunistically. However, these potential roost sites do not provide enough space, shelter, protection, appropriate conditions and/or	Habitat that could be used by small numbers of commuting bats such as gappy hedgerow or unvegetated stream, but isolated, i.e. Not very well connected to the surrounding landscape by other habitat.
		suitable surrounding habitat to be used on a regular basis or by larger numbers of bats (i.e. Unlikely to be suitable for maternity or hibernation).	Suitable but isolated habitat that could only be used by small numbers of foraging bats such as a lone tree (not in a parkland situation) or a patch of scrub.
Amber	Moderate risk	A structure or tree with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by bats due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions and surrounding habitat but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status (with respect to roost type only-the assessments in this table are made irrespective of species conservation status, which is established after presence is confirmed).	Continuous habitat connected to the wider landscape that could be used by bats for commuting such as a line of trees and scrub or linked back gardens. Habitat that is connected to the wider landscape that could be used by bats for foraging such as trees, scrub, grassland or water.
Red	High risk	A structure or tree with one or more potential roost sites that are obviously suitable for use by larger numbers of bats on a more regular basis and potentially for longer periods of time due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions and surrounding habitat.	Continuous, high-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape that is likely to be used regularly by commuting bats such as river valleys, streams, hedgerows, lines of trees and woodland edge. High-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape that is likely to be used regularly by foraging bats such as broadleaved woodland, tree-lined watercourses and grazed parkland. Site is close to and connected to known roosts.

Table 1: Guidelines for assessing the suitability of proposed development sites for bats. Adapted from BCT Bat surveys for Professional Ecologists, Good Practice Guidelines 2016.

#### **4** Constraints

The survey was not constrained.

#### **5** Site Description

The surveyed buildings include a traditionally built farm building, with a modern barn attached.

#### **6 Results**

#### 6.1 Desktop Study

The surveyed site is within an area of high-quality bat foraging habitat, with significant areas of woodland to the south and west, with connectivity via hedgerows. To the north east of the site there is also riparian habitat along 'Bloody Beck', with habitat connectivity via hedgerows.



Figure 2. Aerial view of the surrounding landscape.

#### 6.1.2 Bat Group Records

Records returned from North Yorkshire Bat Group do not contain any from the site itself, and no roost records within 1km of the site. A maternity roost of common pipistrelle bats, and day roosts of whiskered/Brandt's, soprano pipistrelle and brown long-eared bats were noted at Station House, approximately 1.8km south east of the development site. Other bat species recorded in the area include Natterer's and Noctule bats. Table 2 below shows all records returned.

Species	Site	Grid ref.	Quantity	Date	Comment
	Calfwaite Farm,			08-Aug-	
Natterer's Bat	Cloughton	SE990978	1	16	
	Calfwaite Farm,			23-Aug-	
Natterer's Bat	Cloughton	SE990978	1	16	
	Calfwaite Farm,			23-Aug-	
Noctule Bat	Cloughton	SE990978	1	16	
	Station House,				
Common Pipistrelle	Staintondale	SE999977	30	Sep-07	Roost
				29-Jul-	
Common Pipistrelle	SE989985	SE989985	1	08	In flight
	North Bridge Farm,			30-May-	
Common Pipistrelle	Staintondale	SE997978	2	15	
	North Bridge Farm,			16-Jun-	
Common Pipistrelle	Staintondale	SE997978	1	15	
	Calfwaite Farm,			08-Aug-	
Common Pipistrelle	Cloughton	SE990978	1	16	
	Calfwaite Farm,			08-Aug-	
Common Pipistrelle	Cloughton	SE990978	2	16	
	Calfwaite Farm,			23-Aug-	
Common Pipistrelle	Cloughton	SE990978	3	16	
	Calfwaite Farm,			23-Aug-	
Common Pipistrelle	Cloughton	SE990978	4	16	Day roost
	Rudda Farm,			22-Aug-	
Common Pipistrelle	Staintondale	SE9806799555	4	18	Day roost
	Station House,				
Brown Long-eared Bat	Staintondale	SE999977		Sep-07	Roost
	Station House,				
Soprano Pipistrelle	Staintondale	SE999977		Sep-07	In flight
Whiskered / Brandt's	Station House,				
Bat	Staintondale	SE999977		Sep-07	Roost

Table 2: North Yorkshire Bat Group Records

## 6.2 Visual Inspection



Figure 3: Visual inspection results

Building ref.	Description	Features with potential bat roost habitat (PBRH).
1 – Very	One-storey stone-built building, with a relatively	Small area of
low	new roof. Tiles are generally well-sealed, and only	access under
potential	potential access between tiles and liner is at	lowest course of
risk of	lowest course of tiles on western aspect of	tiles.
supporting	building. No evidence of bats identified in this	
bats	location, and no evidence found internally. No	
	evidence of breeding birds.	
2 -	Modern constructed building, which is very well-	No PBRH.
Negligible	sealed. All potential crevices have been sealed	
risk of	with expanding foam. No evidence of bats	
supporting	identified, and no evidence of breeding birds.	
bats.		

Table 3: Visual inspection results

## Site Photographs



Photo 1: Western aspect of Building 1.



Photo 3: Potential access on Building 1.



Photo 5: External view of Building 2.



Photo 2: Southern aspect Building 1.



Photo 4: Internal view of Building 1, and well-sealed wall tops.



Photo 6: Internal view of Building 2.

#### 7 Discussion and Analysis

Very low potential bat roost habitat, suitable for crevice dwelling bat species, such as pipistrelles, was identified in Building 1. Access is limited to a small opening under the lowest course of tiles on the western aspect, this would provide access between the liner and tiles. No evidence of bats was identified below the crevice, or within the crevice itself, which would indicate use. Building 2 is of negligible value for roosting bats, generally due to the construction materials used, and lack of suitable crevices.

We can rule out any use of the buildings by bat species which require a covered void to fly in, including by maternity use. Internal conditions were undisturbed and dry, and there was dense cobwebbing within the internal roofs which are optimal for the preservation of bat droppings and feeding remains. We would expect to find bat droppings within the voids should a maternity roost be present on site.

As the roof of Building 1 is in good condition, there are no plans to alter the roof in any way, therefore it would be disproportionate to recommend an evening emergence survey. Should any works involve the roof, including the liner, and the potential access location, then a bat activity should be carried out to determine presence/absence.

There is no evidence of the use of the site by barn owls, and there was no evidence of breeding birds within either building.

#### 8 Impact Assessment

As there will be no alternations to roof, roof liner, and potential access location, then the impact on bats will be negligible, should they be utilising the site.

If plans change, and any amendments to the roof need to be carried out, a bat activity survey in line with current Bat Conservation Trust Good Practice Guidelines should be carried out on Building 1. This survey can be carried out during the period of May – September. This survey will determine if the roof is being utilised by bats and inform any required mitigation measures and requirement for a European protected Species Licence (EPSL). If the roof is to be altered, then the potential impacts which could arise can be found summarised in Table 4 below.

Impact on bats	Impact on roosting habitats	Impact on commuting and foraging habitats
Physical disturbance	Modification of access point to roost either physically or through,	Modification of commuting or foraging habitats either physically
Noise disturbance through, for example increased human presence or use of noise	for example lighting or removal of vegetation.	or through disturbance, e.g. light spill/noise.
generating equipment.	Modification of roost either physically, for example by roof	Severance of commuting routes (fragmentation)
Injury/mortality (e.g. in roost during destruction or through collision with road/rail traffic)	removal, or through, for example, changed temperature, humidity, ventilation or lighting regime.	Loss of foraging habitats.
	Loss of roost.	

 Table 4: Impacts on bats that can arise from proposed activities (from BCT survey guidelines 2016)

There will be a negligible impact on barn owls and breeding birds due to the development.

#### 9 Mitigation & Compensation

#### 9.1 Mitigation Summary

Bats

The current proposals will have a negligible impact on any potential bat roosting habitat. Therefore, no further surveys are necessary. However, should proposals change, and the roof, the roof liner or the potential access noted on western aspect be altered in any way, further survey effort would be required to determine presence/absence of bats.

#### 9.2 Method Statement

#### Bats

9.2.1 No further survey effort is required based on current proposals.

9.2.2 Should the plans change, and should any alterations be required to the roof, the roof liner, and the potential access noted on western aspect under lowest course of tiles, then bat activity surveys in line with current Bat Conservation Trust Good Practice Guidelines will be carried at the appropriate time of year (May-September) and in suitable weather conditions.

9.2.3 If any roosting bats or evidence of roosting is found to be present, further advice will be sought regarding the need to apply for a European Protected Species Licence (EPSL). If an EPSL is needed, no work shall take place until this has been obtained.

#### 10 Information concerning bat protection and the planning system

#### 10.1 Relevant Legislation

All bat species are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (WCA) 1981 (as amended), the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and the Habitat Regulations 2017.

Under the WCA it is an offence for any person to intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bat; to intentionally disturb any wild bat while it is occupying a structure or place that it uses for shelter or protection; to intentionally damage, destroy or obstruct access to any place that a wild bat uses for shelter or protection; to be in possession or control of any live or dead wild bat, or any part of, or anything derived from a wild bat; or to sell, offer or expose for sale, or possess or transport for the purpose of sale, any live or dead wild bat, or any part of, or anything derived from a wild bat.

Under the Habitat Regulations 2017, it is an offence to (a) deliberately capture, injure or kills any wild animal of a European protected species (EPS), (b) deliberately disturb wild animals of any such species, (c)deliberately take or destroy the eggs of such an animal, or (d)damages or destroys a breeding site or resting place of such an animal. Deliberate disturbance of animals of a European protected species (EPS) includes in particular any disturbance which is likely to impair their ability (i) to survive, to breed or reproduce, or to rear or nurture their young; or (ii) in the case of animals of a hibernating or migratory species, to hibernate or migrate; or to affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species to which they belong.

Prosecution could result in imprisonment, fines of £5,000 per animal affected and confiscation of vehicles and equipment used. In order to minimise the risk of breaking the law it is essential to work with care to avoid harming bats, to be aware of the procedures to be followed if bats are found during works, and to commission surveys and expert advice as required to minimise the risk of reckless harm to bats.

#### 10.2 Licences

Where it is proposed to carry out works which will damage / destroy a bat roost or disturb bats to a significant degree, an EPS licence must first be obtained from the Natural England (even if no bats are expected to be present when the work is carried out). The application for a license normally requires a full knowledge of the use of a site by bats, including species, numbers, and timings. Gathering this information usually involves surveying throughout the bat active season. The licence may require ongoing monitoring of the site following completion of the works.

Licences can only be issued if Natural England are satisfied that there is no satisfactory alternative to the development and that the action authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species at a favourable conservation status in their natural range.

#### 10.3 Planning and Wildlife

National planning guidance for ecological issues is set out in the updated June 2019 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The requirements are consistent with those specified in the July 2018 NPPF; which advocate biodiversity net gain and improvement where possible, as evidenced below.

Paragraph 174 refers to the requirement of plans to "protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity" In order to do this, "plans should:

- a) Identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity; wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them; and areas identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation; and
- b) promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity."

In paragraph 175 the NPPF indicates that "when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:

- a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;
- b) development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;
- c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and
- d) development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity."

The accompanying ODPM / Defra Circular 06/2005 remains pertinent; circular 06/2005 is prescriptive in how planning officers should deal with protected species, see paragraphs 98 and 99:

The presence of a protected species is a material consideration when considering a proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat (see ODPM/Defra Circular, para 98)

LPAs should consider attaching planning conditions/entering into planning obligations to enable protection of species. They should also advise developers that

they must comply with any statutory species protection issues affecting the site (ODPM/Defra Circular, para 98)

The presence and extent to which protected species will be affected must be established before planning permission is granted. If not, a decision will have been made without all the facts (ODPM/Defra Circular, para 99)

Any measures necessary to protect the species should be conditioned/planning obligations used, before the permission is granted. Conditions can also be placed on a permission in order to prevent development proceeding without a Habitats Regulations Licence (ODPM/Defra Circular, para 99).

The need to ensure ecological surveys are carried out should therefore only be left to coverage under planning conditions in exceptional circumstances.

Further to NPPF and OPDM Circular 06/2005, Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) states that 'Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity'. Section 40(3) also states that 'conserving biodiversity includes, in relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat'.

#### **11 References**

BS42020. Biodiversity - Code of Practice for planning and development. British Standards Institution 2013.

Circular 06/05: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - Statutory Obligations and Their Impact Within the Planning System.

http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/circularbiodivers ity

Collins, J. (ed.) (2016) *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines* (3<sup>rd</sup> edn). The Bat Conservation Trust, London.

Mitchell-Jones, A.J. (2004). Bat Mitigation Guidelines. English Nature.

National Planning Policy Framework 2018: <u>https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/revised-national-planning-policy-framework#revised-national-planning-policy-framework</u>

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2017/1012/contents/made

UKBAP 1995. UK Biodiversity Action Plan. http://www.ukbap.org.uk/

University of Bristol 2005. *Online Guide to the bats of Britain.* <u>http://www.bio.bris.ac.uk/research/bats/britishbats/index.htm</u>

#### Appendix 1: Glossary of bat roost terms

#### Bat Roost Definitions:

**Day roost**: a place where individual bats, or small groups of males, rest or shelter in the day but are rarely found by night in the summer.

**Night roost**: a place where bats rest or shelter in the night but are rarely found in the day. May be used by a single individual on occasion or it could be used regularly by the whole colony.

**Feeding roost**: a place where individual bats or a few individuals rest or feed during the night but are rarely present by day.

**Transitional / occasional roost**: used by a few individuals or occasionally small groups for generally short periods of time on waking from hibernation or in the period prior to hibernation.

**Swarming site**: where large numbers of males and females gather during late summer to autumn. Appear to be important mating sites.

**Mating sites**: where mating takes place from later summer and can continue through winter.

Maternity roost: where female bats give birth and raise their young to independence.

**Hibernation roost**: where bats may be found individually or together during winter. They have a constant cool temperature and high humidity.

**Satellite roost**: an alternative roost found in close proximity to the main nursery colony used by a few individual breeding females to small groups of breeding females throughout the breeding season.

# Colin Fenby Design & Consultancy Services

# Structural Condition Report on Existing Barn

## Tofta Farm, Staintondale, North Yorks

## 1. Introduction

At the request of the barn owners, Mr & Mrs Dobson I was asked to carry out a visual structural survey of this barn and to produce a report on my findings.

I therefore visited the property on 15<sup>th</sup> June 2020 and carried out a visual inspection. During my visit I took a series of photographs which form part of the report.

## 2. Proposals

It is understood the owner wishes to convert the barn into a single storey, one bed dwelling.

## 3. Existing Building

The existing building is approximately 15m long x 5.8m wide on a site sloping from front to rear. The front of the building faces approximately north. External walls comprise sandstone in the order of 450mm thick. Internally there are two cross walls splitting the barn into three areas. Two of these areas are covered with a pitched pan tiled roof whilst at the rear end the roof is of a lean to type. The main pitched roof is of rafter and purlin construction and the purlins are, in turn ,supported off gable/internal walls and a King Span truss. The lean to roof comprises timber rafters onto supporting walls.

An adjoining workshop building which runs along the east side of the barn will, it is understood, be removed and re- erected on another part of the farm

The building has relatively recently, been renovated and repaired in many areas eg new pitched and lean to timber roof structures and tiling ,flashings ,masonry pointing ,internal liner blocks to external walls,

NYMNPA 26/08/2020 blockwork cross wall, concrete lintels to openings, etc. This work has been well carried out and the new roof timber sections used acceptable.

However, there are a few structural related items which require attention

## 4. Structural Defects Observed

(a) A short length of the existing west wall, towards the front, exhibits outward bulging at eaves level. This could have been caused by spreading of a former roof truss at this point. It is not considered serious structurally.

(b) Whilst overall the current external stonework is well pointed there is a small section , in the area of the wall 'bulge' mentioned above that requires pointing attention. Also ,the east side wall will require renovation and pointing when the workshop building is removed together with new lintels to proposed windows.

(c) Like many old stone farm buildings the stonework is not always tied together at internal corners. Horizontal metal strapping is required at these corners.

(d) A timber lintel over the door in the west wall looks a little 'suspect '

Although the main walls are ,like many old buildings, founded at shallow levels there did not appear to be any obvious signs of major settlements or cracking having taken place.

## 5. Recommendations

- Repoint small area of external joints to stonework in the vicinity of the wall 'bulge'
- Provide metal corner straps say 40mm x 4mm, minimum leg lengths of say 1m each way. Say 4 no vertically at internal corners, plugged and screwed (heavy duty) or resin anchored into strong points in the existing walls.
- The conversion will need to comply with current Building Regulation requirements and ass such the following will be needed ;
  - Provide insulation and topping screed to ground floors
  - Add additional timbers to the underside of existing rafters to create sufficient depth for the required roof insulation /air gap

- Provide internal liner walls ,incorporating insulation , in block or timber studding ( fixed to the outer walls)
- Review the need for wall dpc (if not already provided) on the two main rooms and front gable walls.

## 6. Conclusions

Subject to satisfactory completion of the above items I am of the opinion that this building will have been restored to a satisfactory structural condition for the intended usage.

## 7.Limitations

Whilst all reasonable care and diligence has been exercised in preparing this report it should be recognised that it is based purely on those elements of the structure readily available to view at the time of my visit. There may be other defective items ,hidden from view, and which could affect the recommendations given and conclusions reached.

Colin Fenby , CEng, FICE, MIStructE

22<sup>nd</sup> June 2020

Colin Fenby Design & Consultancy Services 6 Meadowlands Close, Easington, Saltburn TS13 4PF



Front , North Elevation



Front, North Elevation Shed along side to be removed

Eaves level bulge / missing pointing in west wall



West elevation from rear





East Elevation

Rear or southern elevation

