

Construction of Single Storey Side Extension

2 Railway Cottages, Goathland,
YO22 5NJ

Update following Committee Presentation
22nd July 2021



TM **bhd**
partnership

Address: Airy Hill Manor, Whitby, North Yorkshire YO21 1QB

Contents

1.0 Committee Presentation

2.0 Post Committee

3.0 Current Presentation

4.0 Conclusion

1.0 Committee Presentation

The application submitted to committee was illustrated on drawing D12028-05C. It presented a stone and tiled construction, which extended to the side elevation and also wrapped around to the rear elevation of the property.

The orientation of elevations is not usual in that it was built with the front facing a former railway line to the east. The 'side' elevation where the majority of the extension was proposed, is the elevation furthest away from the road.

For the committee we provided a short list of points which we felt were appropriate, as our previous letter offering to negotiate on the design was not responded to. We also pointed out that in our opinion and experience it was very unusual to prevent a non-designated heritage asset from being extended in any way, which seemed to be officer's stance.

We also felt it was important to confirm that we understood the relevance of the 'front' being the elevation facing the former railway line and had set the extension back to ensure the outline of the main elevation was not interrupted.

During presentation and consideration of the application, we believe the committee requested that officers continue to liaise with the applicant's agent to look at an alternative design.

2.0 Post Committee

We received a letter from officers on the 10th August 2021.

This was a generally positive correspondence which stated that the 'wrap around' element of the scheme was not appropriate "but on a more positive (note) it felt there was scope for some sort of extension"

The letter further guided us to provide something more modern using contrasting materials and be subservient to the host building. It was as we expected, dialog and guidance on a redesigned extension to the north elevation. This letter is attached for reference.

We subsequently did submit an alternative, changing materials and colours but retaining the wrap around element. Officers responded re-iterating that this wrap around element must go but confirming that progress had been made and encouraging an amendment to be provided.

Our clients agreed to this and a design limited to the side (north) elevation was produced and submitted to officers on the 29/11/2021.

The new pallet of materials was kept to provide the contrast to the existing building as stipulated.

Following this, on the 6th December 2021, we received an email giving no advice or comment on the design but withdrawing any support and suggesting permitted development as the only route. The email also seems to suggest differences between the 'Planning' and 'Heritage' front elevations, email attached.

There has been no confusion or difference between Planning and 'Heritage' front elevations. The original letter, the conservation officers' comments, already noted that the east facing the former rail line was the front.

This has been respected in our design with the extension set back and the original buttress, which forms the end of the front elevation, left untouched.

The email received on the 6th December seemed to be a 'U turn'.

3.0 Current Presentation

We are therefore asking for you to consider the design shown on drg. D12028-05H, which is the result of negotiation with officers.

This limits the extension to the north elevation as required and uses contrasting materials to the original building.

Specifically, the materials are: -

- Slate roof
- Render to most of the walls
- Black steel framed windows
- Stone base to walls

Whilst different to the original, the slate and stone give a very strong tie to the traditional setting but leaving the observer with no doubt that it is an extension.

This is the same when viewing the front (east) elevation. The extension is both subservient and set back to protect the G T Andrews original concept.

4.0 Conclusion

We believe that the design follows the directive given by committee for officers to engage in liaison to agree an acceptable outcome for all.

Also that at the time there was no doubt the extension would be on the north elevation but specifically without the wrap-around.

In our opinion officers were correct when encouraging us to provide alternatives but that their subsequent view that no extension apart from permitted development is possible, was a 'U' turn and at odds with committee guidance.

We respectfully request that you support our client's proposal and allow its construction, recognising the improvement made since the scheme was last presented.