
From: Zara Hanshaw
Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2023 1:53 PM
To: Jill Bastow <
Subject: RE: Bat surveys

Hi Jill,

For Prospect House:

I would recommend that we also include a Biodiversity Compensation and Enhancement strategy. This should include plans and details of the type and location of the proposed compensation and enhancement measures included in the submitted Barn Owl and Bat Survey reports by Wold Ecology Ltd. It doesn't look like the submitted plans have been updated in line with the recommendations from the report, and the details for the compensation measures have not been finalised. I would also recommend that an external lighting condition is included- this should include reference to avoiding sensitive areas for roosting bats and barn owls.

Best wishes,

Zara Hanshaw ACIEEM
Ecologist
[\(she/her\)](#)

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

From: Emma Ashton-Wickett
Sent: 13 June 2023 14:06
To: Planning
Subject: NYM/2023/0126 - Prospect House Farm, Hay Lane, Scalby.

Hello,

Many thanks for consulting me on this matter. I have no comments to make.

Thanks.

Emma

Emma Ashton-Wickett
Rights of Way Officer
Recreation and Well-Being
North York Moors National Park Authority
Danby Lodge National Park Centre
Lodge Lane
Danby
Whitby
North Yorkshire
YO21 2NB

Web : www.northyorkmoors.org.uk

AS FROM FROM 22ND MAY 2023 : Please note that my working hours are Tuesday 9.30am – 4.30pm, Wednesday and Thursday and Friday 9.30am – 12.30pm.

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Comments on NYM/2023/0126
Date: 08 June 2023 08:53:02

NYM/2023/0126 Demolish pole barn and lent-to agricultural building, convert agricultural outbuildings into three holiday letting units with associated parking and landscaping works, Prospect House Farm, Hay Lane, Scalby

The above application has been considered by Newby & Scalby Town Council and no objections are offered.

Jools Marley (Mrs) CiLCA
Clerk to the Council

Newby & Scalby Town Council
445b Scalby Road,
Scalby,
SCARBOROUGH

Prospect House Farm

Holding Comment

Thank you for re-consulting me on the amended plans. The proposal is for the conversion of a number of stone built barns and so for ease I have split up my comments:

Windows and Doors

We welcome the changes to stable doors and the removal of some of the faux shutters. As with all windows on curtilage listed buildings they should be in single or slim line double glazing (either timber or aluminium). Joinery details for the windows can be supplied now or as part of a condition.

Including this condition also, *GPMT14 Window frames in reveals to match existing (RSN GPMT02)*
The external face of the frame to all new windows shall be set in reveals to match those of the existing windows and shall be maintained in that condition in perpetuity.

The large upper floor window (formally threshing door) to elevation A, this needs to be set back significantly in its frame (over 75mm). It overlooks the main listed building and over the historic farmyard which has a traditional setting. To avoid it looking dominating, its frame needs to be as thin as possible and painted a dark colour i.e dark grey so it 'disappears' into the glass. All square window openings should be of a 3 over 1 or 4 over 1 design as would be traditional for agricultural windows.

Materials

There needs to be samples provided for all new replacement materials, including the dry stone wall proposed around the property, slate and pantile and mortar used. Mortar should be a hot lime mortar with a bagged finish. All stonework should match the existing, i.e herringbone tooled sandstone.

It is noticed on the plans the removal of the concrete in the inner courtyard. This would leave a considerable gap to get into some of the barns, are steps proposed then?

Lighting

All lighting proposed needs to be provided and its location. Not only so that it is sympathetic to the listed building but so that it is Dark Sky Compliant.

Insulation

With the building being curtilage listed there are certain restrictions (in terms of its conversion) needed to it to preserve it for future generations. It is lucky for the applicant that certain parts of the barns have seen massive intervention and unsympathetic replacement over the years that the conversion requirements would not be as strict as other curtilage listed buildings (and therefore not be as costly).

That said, what is left historic is therefore infinitely more important, any more un-sympathetic development could tip the balance into harmful and the building would be considered eligible to be removed as curtilage.

Modern techniques like a damp proof course would be considered harmful to the building (these are for buildings of modern construction) and are often seen to fail in 10years or so. The stone work, being historic would be damaged by installing a DPC with insulation, you might not be getting damp through to the interior walls with it but it WILL trap moisture in the inside cavity and erode away at the stonework, it is not a suitable technique for walls of an historic construction.

To provide this breathability and moisture barrier, timber fibre board can be installed which would diffuse any moisture in the walls to prevent a build up of damp (on the interior and exterior walls), lime plaster would be suitable to go over the top. This might be a costly alternative now but it will save the applicants money in the long term when damp starts to erode away at the stonework and it needs replacing.

As always, if you can provide adequate justification as to why a DPC with the insulation you want would be a better alternative to the building and its historic fabric than that would be considered as part of your application.

Roof

Thank you for supplying the Colin Fenby Structural Condition Report. I wish to point you to part B Roofs (ii) 'No details of the spans, sizes/spacings for timber rafters and purlins were obtained during this survey, nor a close quarter examination regarding the general condition of the same undertaken, especially at eaves level seating points along external supporting walls. A separate, specialist survey is therefore required to address this and obtain this information as the basis for the new roof design'. – This is exactly what I asked for in my previous comments, and so my comments still stand.

Lucky for the applicants (in terms of cost and justification for removal) the roof timbers to the barns marked B, E and F on the plans (excluding the general store and workshop) are in a bad condition and have been re-roofed in the latter part of the 20th century. The roof timbers have little historic interest to these parts and so are suitable to be replaced. However, as mentioned previously we do require details on what they are to be replaced with, including size, type of material (oak etc) and design of the roof (i.e arranged in a king posts etc). This can be supplied as a simple plan form diagram. There is less concern about the insulation proposed to the roof of these buildings as they are of a modern construction.

However, the roof to the workshop and general store is historic and contains lath and plaster. It contains historic fabric and so needs more care and attention to it. As previously said 'We would not support the removal of timbers in this roof, unless a structural survey is provided to say these timbers have failed, which ones have and what they are being replaced with (like for like replacement only supported)'. With this roof being historic we would want to see a more sympathetic approach here than with the rest of the barns. The lath and plaster should be repaired and re-instated and a sympathetic form of breathable insulation used on the roof;. We would need to know the type of insulation and how it will be applied, we would want to see something breathable like rock wool, hemp board, etc in between the rafters with lime plaster over the top.

Floors

The floors to this collection of farm building have all been screed out with cement in the later part of the 20th century. We would advise for the cement to be removed and a limecrete floor being placed back down with a geotextile membrane like foam glass aggregate. However, with it already been in place, there are no objections to the floors remaining in concrete, we would not support a DPC. If you want to combat any 'potential' build up in water, the concrete floor is the place to target. You are already proposing to relay this floor at present, so I would recommend installing a permeable limecrete floor with foam glass aggregate. It may be more costly, but it is worth making sure the renovation is done right first time and so the applicant does not have to go through these same steps a few years down the line when damp becomes more of an issue through the use of impermeable materials.

SPAB highlights that in recent decades refurbishment of old floors has resulted in old floors being removed for a concrete slab with a DPM (since the 1970s) to prevent damp from rising. This often just pushed the moisture from under the floor into the outside walls. This is frequently misdiagnosed and incorrectly treated when the floor itself shows no signs of failure. In order to meet Building Regulations, solid ground-floor systems must provide a barrier to rising moisture. This is generally achieved with the use of a plastic DPM under a concrete slab. In a limecrete floor, the FGA (foam glass aggregate) is laid as a loose fill and works as a substitute for a DPM. The large granules, typically 20-50mm across, create air gaps that prevent any moisture rising up via capillary action. The granules themselves are closed cell, meaning that they cannot transport moisture from one cell to the next, and perform well in a damp environment.

If the water level rises within a limecrete floor, it is free to do so within the thickness of the foam glass, and to drain freely when the water recedes without causing damage. It is essential as with all floor systems, that any ground water issues are resolved before the installation of the floor. This could involve the construction of French drains around the building or, in some cases, drainage may be necessary beneath the loose-fill insulation layer. Unfortunately, numerous research has shown that a DPC or DPM is not the right option to apply to a building of historic construction and will in the long term create further damage.

Walls

The dry lining and insulation of the walls proposed is objected to, they are considered harmful to the historic fabric of the building. The walls to all the barns need to be in a breathable material to protect and dry out the building; either lime mortar and hemp applied directly to the walls, or wood fibre boards with lime mortar over the top, dry lining is not supported and will cause damage to the walls, the buildings health and potentially the occupants health (through a build up of damp) in the future.

The Structural Condition Survey 5 (x) 'provide concrete thickened edge to new floors to provide a perimeter foundation'. I am not 100% sure what is proposed here but concrete foundations around the building would be objected to as there has been no evidence provided for their need and so would be seen as a harmful intervention.

Re-building

As mentioned previously; The stonework to the barns appears to be in relatively good condition, the 2 stone arches are failing from above and so their re-building is not objected to. A method statement would need to be provided as to how this would be done, however. All cement mortar should be scraped out and replaced and re-pointed with a hot lime mix.

The Structural Condition survey proposes the re-building of numerous walls. A method statement would be needed to show how these walls will be re-built and how the structural integrity of the building will not be damaged when the walls are down.

As always happy to discuss.

ALR

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNCIL

LOCAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY CONSIDERATIONS and RECOMMENDATION



Application No:

NYM23/0126

Proposed Development: demolition of pole barn and lean-to agricultural building, conversion of agricultural outbuildings into three holiday letting units with associated parking together with landscaping works

Location: Prospect House Farm, Hay Lane, Scalby

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Joe & Kimberley Marshall

CH Ref:

Case

Officer:

Kay Aitchison

Area Ref: 4/18/3150A

Tel:

County Road No:

E-mail:

To: North York Moors National Park Authority

Date: 6 June 2023

FAO: Emily Jackson

Copies to:

Note to the Planning Officer:

In assessing the submitted proposals and reaching its recommendation the Local Highway Authority has taken into account the following matters:

The application seeks to convert a disused agricultural building into 3 holiday letting units within an existing farmstead. The access is via a long single track private drive onto Hay Brow Road Scalby. The junction of the access onto Hay Brow Road is very acute and vehicles have difficulty positioning themselves perpendicular to the highway, restricting the practical available visibility. A previously granted application NYM/2022/0338 showed plans to slightly widened the vehicle access point, which will allow vehicles to position themselves more perpendicular. The proposed new access alignment within the highway boundary must be constructed to the LHA specification prior to the commencement of any works which may be granted with this application. It would be advisable for a couple of passing places to be constructed along the length of the private drive to facilitate passing between the additional vehicular traffic and existing farm traffic.

Consequently the Local Highway Authority recommends that the following **Conditions** are attached to any permission granted:

MHC-03 New and altered Private Access Verge Crossing at PROSPECT HOUSE FARM, HAY LANE, SCALBY

The development must not **commence** until the access to the site at **PROSPECT HOUSE FARM, HAY LANE, SCALBY** has been set out and constructed in accordance with the

**LOCAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY
CONSIDERATIONS and RECOMMENDATION**



Continuation
sheet:

Application No:

NYM23/0126

‘Specification for Housing and Industrial Estate Roads and Private Street Works’ published by the Local Highway Authority and the following requirements:

The crossing of the highway verge must be constructed in accordance with the approved details and Standard Detail number **E9A** and the following requirements.

- Any gates or barriers must be erected **at the highway boundary** and must not be able to swing over the existing or proposed highway.
- The final surfacing of any private access within 1 metre of the public highway must not contain any loose material that is capable of being drawn on to the existing or proposed public highway.

All works must accord with the approved details.

Reason for Condition

To ensure a satisfactory means of access to the site from the public highway in the interests of highway safety and the convenience of all highway users.

MHi-C New and altered Private Access Verge Crossing – (MHC-03)

Notwithstanding any valid planning permission for works to amend the existing highway, you are advised that a separate licence will be required from North Yorkshire County Council as the Local Highway Authority in order to allow any works in the existing public highway to be carried out. The ‘Specification for Housing and Industrial Estate Roads and Private Street Works’ published by North Yorkshire County Council as the Local Highway Authority, is available to download from the County Council’s web site:

https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/sites/default/files/fileroot/Transport%20and%20streets/Roads%2C%20highways%20and%20pavements/Specification_for_housing___ind_est_roads___street_works_2nd_edition.pdf

The Local Highway Authority will also be pleased to provide the detailed constructional specifications referred to in this condition.

Signed:

Kay Aitchison

for Corporate Director of Environment

Issued by:

*Whitby Highways Office
Discovery Way
Whitby
North Yorkshire
YO22 4PZ*

e-mail:

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Comments on NYM/2023/0126 - Case Officer Mrs Jill Bastow - Received from Building Conservation at The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York, YO62 5BP,
Date: 02 June 2023 14:17:56

please see comments by email
thank you

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: 607109

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: FW: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Planning Application-NYM/2023/0126 Prospect House Farm -demolition of pole barn and lean-to agricultural building and construction of 3x holiday lets
Date: 23 May 2023 15:21:28

Dear planning,

In addition to the email below , I wish to make the following comments:

Contaminated land from pre-use

Contaminated Land.

Although the site is largely of agricultural building usage it maybe that contamination may be present on the site from the storage of pesticides or fertilizers. In an addition the presence of asbestos within the fabric of the buildings is possible..

Development shall not commence until actual or potential land contamination at the site has been investigated and a Phase I Desk Study Report has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reports shall be prepared in accordance with CLR11.

Submission of Phase II Intrusive Site Investigation Report

Should further intrusive investigation be recommended in the Phase I Report, development shall not commence until a Phase II Intrusive Site Investigation Report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Phase II Intrusive Site Investigation Report shall be prepared in accordance with CLR11.

Regards

Tim Croot

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: COMMENTS: Planning Application-NYM/2023/0126 Prospect House Farm -demolition of pole barn and lean-to agricultural building and construction of 3x holiday lets
Date: 23 May 2023 15:15:41

Dear sirs

COMMENTS: Planning Application-NYM/2023/0126 Prospect House Farm -demolition of pole barn and lean-to agricultural building and construction of 3x holiday lets

I have received the above application.

Informative(s):

Water supply:

We have been advised that the proposed use is connected to mains water supply. If this is not the case and you are to use a private water supply (such as a bore hole, spring or well) you must register with this local authority by visiting:

<https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/environment-and-neighbourhoods/private-water-supplies>

Waste collection:

As a commercial operator of holiday lets, you do not qualify for the domestic waste collection. You must use the services of a waste collection provider and keep waste transfer notes of that supplier for a period of 2 years.

Please visit:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/waste-duty-of-care-code-of-practice>

Regards

Tim Croot BSc (hons) PGdip MCIEH CEnvH MIOSH
Environmental Health Officer
Chartered Environmental Health Practitioner

North Yorkshire Council
Environmental Health Services
Town Hall
St Nicholas Street

Scarborough
YO11 2HG

Web: www.northyorks.gov.uk

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Comments on NYM/2023/0126 - Case Officer Mrs Jill Bastow - Received from Mr Ben Jackson at NYMNP, The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley York YO62 5BP
Date: 22 May 2023 16:18:00

There is a public bridleway adjacent to this development. It doesn't appear that the plans interfere with the line of the public rights of way.

You must ensure that the public bridleway remains available and free from obstruction or encroachment throughout the development.

Comments made by Mr Ben Jackson of NYMNP, The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley York YO62 5BP

Preferred Method of Contact is Post

Comment Type is Comment

From:
To:
Subject: Prospect House Farm, Hay Lane, Scalby - conversion of agricultural outbuildings into three holiday letting units etc. NYM/2023/0126
Date: 17 May 2023 16:04:31
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

FAO Miss Emily Jackson

Prospect House Farm, Hay Lane, Scalby - conversion of agricultural outbuildings into three holiday letting units etc. NYM/2023/0126

I refer to your e-mail of the 17th May 2023 in respect of the above application. My only comment in relation to the proposals is as follows:

The access stairs for the first floor areas of unit 1 and unit 2 both lead down into a high-risk kitchen area. This compromises the means of escape from the upper floors. An alternate means of escape should be provided, such as a suitably-sized escape window, from the first floor.

Thanks

Steve

Steve Reynolds DipAc, DipEH, BSc, DMS, MSc(ENG), MCIEH, CEnvH, CMIWM
Residential Regulation Manager

North Yorkshire Council
Housing Services
Town Hall
St Nicholas Street
Scarborough
YO12 2HG

