
From:
Sent: 24 September 2021 17:34
To: Planning
Subject: Comments on NYM/2021/0049/LB - Case Officer Miss Kelsey Blain - Received from Building Conservation at The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York, YO62 5BP, via

please see comments on FL

Comments made by Building Conservation of The Old Vicarage Bondgate Helmsley York YO62 5BP

Preferred Method of Contact is: Post

Comment Type is Comment
Letter ID: 574503

From:
To: [Planning](#);
Cc:
Subject: RE: Comments on NYM/2021/0049/LB have been received by the council.
Date: 01 July 2021 20:29:04

Whilst the omission of the rooflights is welcome - as per my previous comments the design does not achieve two very important aspects of the building; an internal space where the full height can be appreciated, and the cutting of a large opening.

Again I would urge the agent to reconsider the approach here, something akin to image 25 in Historic England's guidance 'Adapting Traditional Farm Buildings' <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/adapting-traditional-farm-buildings/heag158-adapting-traditional-farm-buildings/> (source already provided) could alleviate this design problem. It is worth stating that as adopted guidance of Historic England this document is a material consideration in planning as well as listed building matters. The issue with large glazed openings is that they can sometimes dominate a façade, this is a concern here, recessing the glazing by 1m or so would alleviate this and the reflection, whilst allowing more light into the space, creating a light well of sorts.

A large part of the significance of the barn is that it is a large open space, typical of threshing barns. To subdivide the space is always going to take away from that, however, a common compromise is to have one section of the space open to full height for the width of the building in order to give a sense of openness. Part 4 of the design guidance issued by the NYM is aimed at conversion of undesignated traditional agricultural buildings states that new internal floors in building that originally lacked them should be kept to a minimum. Historic England's guidance 'Adapting Traditional Farm Buildings' states in regards to insertion of new floors and subdivisions "Another difficult aspect of farm building adaptation can be the incorporation of functions that require subdivision of the existing open spaces. This is especially the case with threshing barns, the upper floors of combination barns and loft areas that are significant for their impressive proportions and long sight-lines and whose significance would be harmed by subdivision."

I have also noticed that given the floor level indicated by the cut through the large opening, there will likely be insufficient head space within the rooms given the position of the trusses. The removal or adaptation of the trusses would not be supported in any circumstance. Can the applicant please clarify this matter.

I appreciate that some of these matters are driven by a desire to achieve the space without the need for new openings. But it should be noted that there are openings on the rear side that could be used for the development and that would allow for easier use of the space and that this is hindered by the covered yard area. We do not consider the covered yard to be traditional and form part of the traditional building and would consider its removal an improvement. Whilst we cannot insist on its removal and the desire to keep it is reasonable, this needs to be taken into account when considering the impacts of the proposal. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF states that "Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives [Economic, social and environmental (this includes the historic environment)], which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways". As such one benefit does not outweigh the other and these matters need to be considered. Historic England in GPA2 also advises that "Successful sustainable development achieves economic, social and environmental gains jointly and simultaneously through planning decisions (NPPF, Paragraph 8). If there is any apparent conflict between the proposed development and the conservation of a heritage asset then the decision-maker might need to consider whether alternative means of delivering the development benefits could achieve a more sustainable result, before proceeding to weigh benefits against any harm."

The building is currently in a good state of repair on an occupied multigenerational farmstead. The current proposals are considered to be harmful to the significance of the listed building for the reasons clarified above. When assessing applications the NPPF and local policy SPI advises us that "Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal". In this case there are no public benefits of the proposal. Unfortunately, in its current form I would recommend this application for refusal.

From: planning@northyorkmoors.org.uk
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Comments on NYM/2021/0049/LB - Case Officer Miss Kelsey Blain - Received from Building Conservation at The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York, YO62 5BP,
Date: 01 July 2021 20:22:58

Please see email to case officer

Comments made by Building Conservation of The Old Vicarage
Bondgate
Helmsley
York
YO62 5BP

Comment Type is Object with comments
Letter ID: 569798

From:
To: [Planning](#);
Cc:
Subject: RE: Comments on NYM/2021/0049/LB have been received by the council.
Date: 01 July 2021 20:29:04

Whilst the omission of the rooflights is welcome - as per my previous comments the design does not achieve two very important aspects of the building; an internal space where the full height can be appreciated, and the cutting of a large opening.

Again I would urge the agent to reconsider the approach here, something akin to image 25 in Historic England's guidance 'Adapting Traditional Farm Buildings' <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/adapting-traditional-farm-buildings/heag158-adapting-traditional-farm-buildings/> (source already provided) could alleviate this design problem. It is worth stating that as adopted guidance of Historic England this document is a material consideration in planning as well as listed building matters. The issue with large glazed openings is that they can sometimes dominate a façade, this is a concern here, recessing the glazing by 1m or so would alleviate this and the reflection, whilst allowing more light into the space, creating a light well of sorts.

A large part of the significance of the barn is that it is a large open space, typical of threshing barns. To subdivide the space is always going to take away from that, however, a common compromise is to have one section of the space open to full height for the width of the building in order to give a sense of openness. Part 4 of the design guidance issued by the NYM is aimed at conversion of undesignated traditional agricultural buildings stages that new internal floors in building that originally lacked them should be kept to a minimum. Historic England's guidance 'Adapting Traditional Farm Buildings' states in regards to insertion of new floors and subdivisions "Another difficult aspect of farm building adaptation can be the incorporation of functions that require subdivision of the existing open spaces. This is especially the case with threshing barns, the upper floors of combination barns and loft areas that are significant for their impressive proportions and long sight-lines and whose significance would be harmed by subdivision."

I have also noticed that given the floor level indicated by the cut through the large opening, there will likely be insufficient head space within the rooms given the position of the trusses. The removal or adaptation of the trusses would not be supported in any circumstance. Can the applicant please clarify this matter.

I appreciate that some of these matters are driven by a desire to achieve the space without the need for new openings. But it should be noted that there are openings on the rear side that could be used for the development and that would allow for easier use of the space and that this is hindered by the covered yard area. We do not consider the covered yard to be traditional and form part of the traditional building and would consider its removal an improvement. Whilst we cannot insist on its removal and the desire to keep it is reasonable, this needs to be taken into account when considering the impacts of the proposal. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF states that "Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives [Economic, social and environmental (this includes the historic environment)], which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways". As such one benefit does not outweigh the other and these matters need to be considered. Historic England in GPA2 also advises that "Successful sustainable development achieves economic, social and environmental gains jointly and simultaneously through planning decisions (NPPF, Paragraph 8). If there is any apparent conflict between the proposed development and the conservation of a heritage asset then the decision-maker might need to consider whether alternative means of delivering the development benefits could achieve a more sustainable result, before proceeding to weigh benefits against any harm."

The building is currently in a good state of repair on an occupied multigenerational farmstead. The current proposals are considered to be harmful to the significance of the listed building for the reasons clarified above. When assessing applications the NPPF and local policy SPI advises us that "Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal". In this case there are no public benefits of the proposal. Unfortunately, in its current form I would recommend this application for refusal.

From: planning@northyorkmoors.org.uk
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Comments on NYM/2021/0049/LB - Case Officer Miss Kelsey Blain - Received from Building Conservation at The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York, YO62 5BP,
Date: 24 June 2021 12:28:19

Whilst the revised plans avoid the need (excluding rooflights) for additional openings the use of space is poor. The rooflight for bedroom 2 and not required. Particularly harmful is the loss of any full height space and the cutting on the large doorway. I would advise that the applicants look to HE guidance <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/adapting-traditional-farm-buildings/heag158-adapting-traditional-farm-buildings/> this discusses options for large doorways and the importance of full height spaces. Consideration should be given to the removal of the covered yard and the use of openings on that elevation to allow better use of the space.

Comments made by Building Conservation of The Old Vicarage
Bondgate
Helmsley
York
YO62 5BP

Comment Type is Comment
Letter ID: 568039

From:
To:
Cc: [Planning](#);
Subject: NYM/2021/0048/FL and 0049/LB - Northfield Farm, Suffield
Date: 19 April 2021 17:09:59

Dear Kelsey

The applications are submitted by a Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment which has identified that, after inspection of the few crevices available on the buildings, that risk of bat roosting within the affected barns is negligible, and therefore no further bat assessment is necessary for the purposes of the planning applications. With reference to the bat interest therefore, planning permission may be given. Section 7 of the report covering mitigations and compensation measures, including safe methods of work to minimise any residual impact on bats, as well as guidance on external lighting and legislation and guidance relating to nesting birds has been provided and should be conditioned if the applications are approved.

The applicant has indicated that the converted barns will be drained to a septic tank, but not whether this is an existing unit or a new installation. Septic tanks are no longer permitted to drain to watercourse, and therefore please seek confirmation from the applicant regarding the location of the intended tank and that this will discharge to a drainage field at least 10m from the nearest watercourse or field drain. If an existing unit is to be used, we may also require confirmation that the unit has sufficient capacity to deal with the waste arising from the proposed development in addition to the current use. Package treatment plants are now commonly available and greatly reduce the pollutants contained in the effluent from the system, so if a new system is to be installed I would strongly recommend the applicants look into installing a suitable high quality PTP rather than septic tank if possible. PTPs can be discharged to drainage field or watercourse.

Details of any external lighting proposed should be reserved by condition please.

Kind regards

Elsbeth

Elsbeth Ingleby MA_{Cantab} ACIEEM

Ecologist

North York Moors National Park Authority

The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York YO62 5BP

From: planning@northyorkmoors.org.uk
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Comments on NYM/2021/0049/LB - Case Officer Miss Kelsey Blain - Received from Building Conservation at The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York, YO62 5BP,
Date: 25 March 2021 11:44:37

Please request a site meeting

Comments made by Building Conservation of The Old Vicarage
Bondgate
Helmsley
York
YO62 5BP

Comment Type is Request for a meeting
Letter ID: 563440