From:	
To:	Planning
Subject:	Comments on NYM/2023/0525 - Case Officer Jill Bastow - Received from Mrs Jude Wakefield at Fylingdales Parish Council, 38 Hinderwell Lane, Runswick Bay, TS13 5HR
Date:	13 June 2024 12:49:10

This planning application arrived after the Parish Council agenda had been published for the June meeting and could not therefore be discussed. I requested an extension until after the July meeting but this was denied. I therefore asked the Councillors for their thoughts via email.

Their feeling is that the conversion is too invasive, on a number of levels and would cause harm to the existing listed property. The underfloor heating poses several issues, like, raising of the ground floor level and potential shrinkage to upper floor listed joists, together with their T & G floor boards. These, together with skirting boards, will require lifting and it is unlikely they can be safely removed without damage.

A more traditional approach to the damp proofing should be considered, as the modern methods proposed are not the generally acceptable, or a proven method, in a listed building.

In general, their quest to make the building more highly energy efficient, has the potential to cause inherent harm and we would ask that you take this into consideration when determining the outcome of this planning application.

Comments made by Mrs Jude Wakefield of Fylingdales Parish Council, 38 Hinderwell Lane, Runswick Bay, TS13 5HR

Preferred Method of Contact is Email

Comment Type is Object with comments

From:

Cc:
Subject: Comments for NYM/2023/0527 & NYM/2023/0525, Burleigh Cottage, Brig Garth, Robin Hoods Bay
Date: 12 June 2024 13:02:47

Hi Jill,
Please find my comments below, any questions please let me know,
NYM/2023/0527 & NYM/2023/0525.
Although a lot more information has been added to the plans, the proposal still appears to be the same as my previous comments, apart from the additions of glass balustrades.
Kind Regards

Objection
Burleigh Cottage is a grade 2 listed building in a prominent position in the Robin Hoods Bay Conservation Area. Therefore, this application has been determined in accordance with Section 16, 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Chapter 16 of the NPPF paragraphs 195, 200, 201 and 206, as well as, Policy ENV11 of the North York Moors National Park Authority Local Plan (July 2020).
There is a large amount of works proposed to this listed building in the name of energy efficiency. Following the Conservation principal of minimum intervention only the minimal works should be done towards a listed building. This does not mean that the property cannot be brought up to energy efficiency standards, but it has to be a balance with the heritage of the building and all risks caused by potential retrofit assessed.

Following guidance set out in BS 7913, all retrofitting measures need to be assessed towards the sustainability of the building and make sure that they do not cause further hazards down the line, like increased condensation and mould growth. Following this British Standards document and guidance from Historic England any harmful measures at present should be addressed first and the building should be brought into a good state of repair before anything (like internal insulation is added). This lets the building dry out first and make sure that the thermal envelope is working before internal insulation is added. If the building is not functioning properly, internal insulation has the chance to fail and cause condensation to build up between the insulation and the walls.

Therefore, the guttering should be cleaned and repaired (and added to in cast iron), the cement pointing should be removed and replaced with a non-hydraulic lime and any cement floors should be removed and replaced with a limecrete floor.

On a recent site visit it was assessed that there was more historic fabric then originally thought, especially with the benefit of the test holes I had asked for. A number of walls are still lime plaster (with an animal hair composition) with a lath and plaster base and these should be retained. It is not necessary to remove this historic plaster along with the skirting, whilst increasing the risk of causing damage to the lath and plaster. The proposal also puts a TYVEK vapour permeable membrane on all walls, which although vapour permeable it has a lower level of permeability and so has the potential to slow down any diffusion of water and salt across the walls.
The applicants have proposed an nhl (REBOCO and CAL) which I have stated earlier is unlikely to be supported due to its excessive strength and reduced vapour permeability. The plans also state the use of super fine plaster, however, this could incorporate a wide range of plasters and so unless stated which is difficult for me to assess any possible damage. The plans show historic skirting is proposed

to be removed and reinstated but there are concerns it will be not survive this alteration and is too fragile. There are also concerns about internal insulation (approx.. 7cm thick) merging an historic cupboard into the walls (bedroom 1) as well as around the window architraves, so these are flush with the wall. The proposal will use a thinner thickness of insulation around these historic details, which will cause a thermal bridge and increase the chances of condensation. These lime plaster walls are historic and functioning properly and removal should be resisted. Many visually inappropriate and other physically damaging repairs have been executed in the last few decades because modern methods and materials have been used. Internal insulation is incredibly risky when it comes to houses of traditional construction and unfortunately, I still have major concerns about internally insulating the listed building. Where there is gypsum (assessed on site to be the first floor bathroom and proposed kitchen/dinner), this should of course be removed and replaced with a lime plaster with hemp fibre for added insulating properties (not an nhl).
The Responsible Retrofit Wheel by the Sustainable Building Alliance notes 8 Technical Concerns with internal insulation, these being:
Interstitial Condensation (high)
Trapped Moisture (High)
Thermal Bridges (High)
Overheating (High)
Personal Capacity/Right Opportunity (High)
Building Control (medium)
Rain and Drains (Liquid moisture penetration) (medium)
Monitoring and feedback required (medium).

With reference to Building Control above, no information has been submitted as to if the proposal and its technical details are likely to be approved by a building inspector and to establish whether approval or warrant for work is required. The relevant part(s) of the current building code need to be established to see if they are relevant or affect the proposal, (especially when it comes to fire proofing, subdivision and internal insulation). Any additional implications of your measure need to be considered. Working in consultation with building control assesses the suitability of the scheme and whether the design would need altering by an inspector which therefore could create extra risks to the heritage of the building.

Internal insulation is a high risk measure and everything else that causes less harm should be done to increase the energy efficiency of the building before harmful measures are proposed. As regards to the proposed lime plastering on the walls, and as said in my earlier comments, the use of an nhl on the lower ground floor rear wall was only permittable to give the applicants time to try to assess the severity of the rainwater run off from the footpath, it would not stop the damp being driven into this wall externally and further explorations were needed to protect this external wall.
There are also concerns about the Newtonite membrane to ground floor, which is completely waterproof. We set out last year a method acceptable of dealing with this water ingress what has been used in other surrounding listed building in the Bay, it is this method we would want to see being adopted. We understand that the clients are looking into the water ingress to this walls and so far they have found a drain stopping underneath the floors and a broken drain outside. Getting this sorted is all going to help with the damp issues in this underground wall, but completely sealing it off with a completely vapour impermeable membrane is just keeping moisture into this wall and has the potential to damage the fabric of the building.
It is inevitable that a number of fire proofing methods will have to be installed into the building if it is

split in 2. These extra risks could be of impermeable materials which have the opportunity to cause harm to the listed building, The plans state 'Full construction to achieve 60mins fire resistance' to the ground floor and 'This document does not consider the requirements of building regulations, which will be developed further once planning is approved. We reserve the right to modify this document and activities in line with the requirements of the building regulations'. Without knowing what is fully proposed we cannot assess any damage to the listed building. Any plans to fireproof the building would usually require Listed Building Consent and so cannot be assessed in this application without knowing fully what is proposed so any risks are minimised.

The underfloor heating, as previously said this is fine on the ground floor where a limecrete floor is proposed. The proposed kitchen/diner on the plans also has modern floorboards and no skirting and so is suitable for overlaying of overfloor heating. The rest of the building seems to have a collection of historic floorboards. Not only is the added extra weight of overfloor heating with reclaimed floorboards a concern, there are concerns about the extra heat cracking these timbers and the added height cutting into fireplace, skirting and door and frames. A less harmful solution would be to reinstate the radiators in these rooms. Some historic floors have missing planks with ply, changing these small areas will not cause concern.
The Fresh air ventilation system on the plans, no information has been submitted as to what system this is and what extra piping is needed. I cannot comment on the suitability of this for a listed building without knowing what is proposed.
The External joinery to be painted with heritage colour 'Stiffkey blue' Matt (Farrow and Ball). As mentioned previously this is an extremely dark blue with black undertones. When you paint historic timber work with a dark colour you tend to loose the historical detailing from the windows and the glazing bars 'disappear' into the glasswork. This affects the setting of the building and is not a typical colour for windows in listed buildings in RHB. What is acceptable is the 2 tone colour seen in Robin Hoods Bay, such as the frame is painted a darker colour and the stone cils but the window is kept white. The colour is fine for the shop front, the door and below the bay window. The windows should be kept white or a similar paler colour so there historic detailing can be easily seen.
The plans mention 'the stair is in need of a full overhaul. All replacements to be formed in timber'. The stairs have been assessed to be in a good condition and have some interesting vertical timber cladding to parts. Following the principles of minimal intervention, we need to know exactly what is proposed on the stairs and what is proposed to be removed (including which treads). The Glazed guarding to the stairwell and the Stair to be enclosed with a black framed glazed screen and door is not characteristic of a listed building as this type and will look out of place. A simple timber banister should be reinstated as is traditional for the character of the building.
The New soil pipe, we would need the plans to assess why an additional soil pipe is needed and why the new pipework can't make use of the existing.
The recent site visit showed that the shiplap panelling (present in the attic, first floor bathroom and bedroom 2) is difficult to be removed without affecting the lath and plaster behind. The small bathroom had its modern panelling removed to the ceiling, but showed damage to the lath and plaster behind. Although the bathroom and bedroom 2 appears to be mid-late 20th century panelling, its removal comes with it the potential of more damage and so should be reinstated; this is the benefit of the test trial to the bathroom. To the attic, the majority appears to be shiplap panelling to the ceiling and a talk with the builder on site showed it will be extremely difficult to remove without damaging any historic fabric behind, such as lath and plaster and the ships timber beams (mentioned on the list description). The panelling will be giving some insulating properties and adds to the 'fisherman's cottage' character of the building and so its removal is resisted. The builder said that insulation could be added from above and so this is a less harmful alternative and maybe something

to consider in the future.

My earlier comments for the subdivision of the building are still relevant and will require a lot of additional materials and pipe work to be added, please refer to them.

On a recent site visit it was noticed that extra timbers had been added to the ceiling to support it and a window had been removed. This application has been going on for some time now and as suggested previously, I would recommend splitting the LBC and putting the less harmful proposals of the scheme (likely to be approved) into another application. This would mean the applicants can start work (after it is approved) on getting the building back into a good state of repair:
This would include, the new cast iron guttering, re-pointing the exterior walls, replacing the concrete steps with stone, limecrete flooring, works to the ground floor chimney breast, re-painting (subject to comments above), removal of plaster on the lower ground floor, removal of plaster on the proposed kitchen, removal of breezeblock walls to lower ground kitchen (although structural survey needed); re-pointing and re-plastering with a non-hydraulic lime to these rooms, new back and front doors (design to be approved), new rear rooflight, new attic timber banister, works to remove the modern stud wall in the stairwell bathroom and replace, repairs to historic timber floors, floor insulation below these timbers, etc This would enable the building to be used again.

The proposal is still objected to as substantial harm towards the listed building being Burleigh Cottage, for the added risks caused to the fabric of the building and the removal of historic features, as per my previous comments.

ALR

From:
To: Planning
Subject: Re: NYM/2023/0525, Burleigh Cottage, Brig Garth, Robin Hoods Bay
Date: 05 June 2024 11:59:02

Good Morning
This planning application arrived after the agenda for the June meeting had been published. Can I please request an extension for submission of comments to 22 July 2024.
Many thanks.
Kind regards

Council for British Archaeology

Buildings Archaeology Team

A National Amenity Society

Ms Annabel Longfield-Reeve,
Senior Heritage & Conservation Officer
North York Moors National Park Authority
By email: a

3rd May 2024

Burleigh (Burley) Cottage, Brig Garth, Robin Hoods Bay, YO22 4SJ. Application NYM/2023/0527

Dear Ms Longfield-Reeve,

Thank you for notifying the Council for British Archaeology (CBA) about the above application. Based on the information supplied with this application, we offer the following observations and advice to assist your authority in determining the application.

Many of our immediate concerns when looking at the proposed plans for Burleigh Cottage have been answered by reading through the exchanges between the NYM planning department and the applicants' representatives – removal of the stairs between the ground and first floor, subdivision of the building into two distinct holiday lets etc. We are also reassured to see that the proposals are informed by a familiarity with the need to use breathable building materials and remove impermeable fabric as the initial means of reducing damp within the building and to support the long term health of the building.

The CBA are concerned about the impact that some of the proposed interventions will have on historic building fabric. Specifically, details B and C on Plan No. 12540-04 . Detail C helpfully outlines the method proposed for introducing underfloor heating under the existing timber floorboards. It notes that 'shrinkage may occur to timber boards'. The CBA would expect the impact of a directly adjacent permanent heat source on the old floorboards to be both warping and shrinkage. We therefore question whether this replacement of the existing radiator based central heating system is in the best interests of the building. If the underfloor heating system compromises the flooring then it would be contrary to NPPF paragraph 205 to ascribe 'great weight' to conservation of the building's significance. Whilst we are unconvinced by the principle of installing underfloor heating beneath old timber boards, we recognise this may be from a lack of familiarity with this practice. Are there any tried and tested examples of this kind of heating scheme that would make it more persuasive in terms of impacts on the historic floorboards. The CBA support the methodology set out in Detail A for an insulated floor system on the lower ground floor.

Council for British Archaeology
De Grey House
St Leonard's Place
York,YO1 7HE

archaeologyuk.org

info@archaeologyuk.org

Registered charity in England and Wales (287815) and Scotland (SC041971)
Company Limited by Guarantee (1760254)
Patron: HRH The Prince of Wales

Council for British Archaeology

Buildings Archaeology Team

The CBA are concerned about the impact that introducing internal insulation to the external walls (detail B) will have on door and window reveals. It is proposed to remove door and window cases. We note the proposal to reinstate the existing joinery, however it would be surprising if it is not damaged in the process and will not fit once reinstated onto a deeper wall. Whilst we note from correspondence that the applicants work in the 'thermal efficiency' industry, the CBA question whether this level of intervention is necessary given the thermal value of such thick stone walls.

I trust these comments are useful to you; please keep the CBA informed of any developments with this case.

Kind Regards,

Catherine Bell. MA (cons), ACIfA
Listed Buildings Caseworker

The Council for British Archaeology (CBA) is the national amenity society concerned with protection of the archaeological interest in heritage assets. Local planning authorities have a duty to notify the CBA of applications for listed building consent involving partial or total demolition, under the procedures set out in, **Arrangements for handling heritage applications – notification To Historic England and National Amenity Societies and the Secretary of state (England) direction 2021**.

From: Annabel Longfield-Reeve <
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2024 3:58 PM
To: Jill Bastow
Subject: Burley Cottage

Hi Jill,
I've tried to keep them as condensed as possible.
Please find my comments for Burley Cottage attached.
Objections are as follows:

Removal of historic fabric (skirting and 'rough' lime plastered walls)
Additions of d.p.m and natural hydraulic lime.
Extra weight onto historic ceilings – from underfloor heating and new floorboards
Insulation and new floor cutting into historical features and merging them into walls
Splitting the building in 2 – reducing its optimum viable usage and the extra additions that would require for B'Regs
Front elevation rooflight

Thanks
Annabel

Annabel Longfield-Reeve
Senior Heritage & Conservation Officer
North York Moors National Park Authority

Burley Cottage

Objection

Burley Cottage is a grade 2 listed building in a prominent position in the Robin Hoods Bay Conservation Area. Therefore, this application has been assessed in accordance with Section 16, 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Chapter 16 of the NPPF paragraphs 195, 200, 201, 202 and 206, as well as, Policy ENV11 of the North York Moors National Park Authority Local Plan (July 2020).

Talks have been going on for over a year now and advice has been given since pre-application stage on the most efficient, less invasive way to make this building more energy efficient. Unfortunately, as previously stated the proposal is extremely harmful and risks further additions to the listed building which could make it less energy efficient and remove historic fabric.

The removal of internal plasterwork and skirting and replacement with a natural hydraulic lime (nhl) will not only stop the breathability of the building but will see the removal of a number of historic features. Historic England is now known to have banned the use of nhls in the restoration of their buildings due to its excessive strength and characteristics comparable with cement. Skirting is proposed to be removed and reinstated but there are concerns it will be not survive this alteration and is too fragile. There are also concerns about internal insulation (approx.. 10cm thick) merging an historic cupboard into the walls as well as around the window architraves, so there is no reveal (approx.. 6cm proposed around the architraves).

The walls show signs of a rough lime plaster finish, typical of historic construction. It is important, therefore, that original plaster is examined to establish its basic properties before repairs begin. Gypsum was used as an addition to lime plastering in the 19th Century (and probably why the applicants have stated the presence of gypsum in the walls). As we repair and reinstate historic plasterwork, it is important that we understand the materials and methods used in the first place. Many visually inappropriate and other physically damaging repairs have been executed in the last few decades because modern methods and materials have been used without thought. Modern gypsum for example is very unsuitable for listed buildings and should be removed.
There has not been enough evidence provided for the composition of the plasterwork in the listed buildings walls and so I am reluctant to accept its full removal. Any wall plastering repairs should be of a traditional lime mix based on a typical mix of a non-hydraulic quicklime mortar mixed at a ratio of 1:3 (dry non-hydraulic quicklime: sand).

Floor insulation. The ground floor has been unsympathetically screed out in cement. Its replacement with a limecrete floor and geotextile membrane is welcomed and will aid breathability. However, Wall insulation detail B D12540-04 states a damp proof membrane will be used. As I have explained before listed buildings need to remain breathable and any attempt to stop or slow down the movement of salts through the wall will cause a build up of damp (the same with the Tyvek vapour membrane proposed to all walls). As advice from Historic Englands technical team explains; The term breathability is confusing, and it's used by different industries to mean different things. Many manufactures claim that their product is breathable, sometimes they clarify this as being vapour permeable. But moisture does not transfer efficiently in its vapour form through porous building fabric, it transfers in its liquid state. The test for vapour permeability is conducted with a very thin section of materials, where moisture vapour is forced through under pressure – so it does not in any way reflect real life scenarios we see in traditional buildings. If it passes this test, manufactures claim it's breathable.

In the context of traditional buildings, it will in the long term trap the natural moisture evident in traditional materials, or any moisture that enters the building through leaks. This will risk damp and decay if used alongside traditional building fabric and make the building less energy efficient.

Underfloor heating. Suspended timber floor detail C on the plans D12540-04 Rev F stated that historic floorboards would be lifted, breathable insulation would be fitted between existing joists, underfloor heating laid and historic floorboards replaced on top. The Listed Building Features document provided changes this to the historic floorboards will be left in place, underfloor heating placed on top then new reclaimed floorboards above. This document then states bowing to some ceilings. This is a lot of extra weight on these ceilings when other methods of heating are available and less invasive (radiators). If the ceilings could not hold this extra weight then it is presumed extra supports would be needed? Until a structural survey is done to confirm that the historic ceilings can hold this extra weight there are now concerns about the proposal for underfloor heating. There are also concerns about the added height of the floor cutting into historic cupboards and fireplaces.

Splitting the cottage into 2 – The proposal for this is to create 2 holiday cottages. I have spoken to Building Regulations and they have confirmed that a number of things would be required to do this, including fire proofing to the walls and ceiling (creation of a faux ceiling), extra boarding out and sufficient amenity space etc none of these have been provided for in this application and so I cannot assess fully how much extra work is needed for this change. The stairs to the ground floor are a modern replacement, of which I cannot find any LBC for. Under para. 202 of the NPPF 'Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision' the modern stairs cannot be used as justification for splitting the cottage in half.

Regardless of this, the landing at the top of these stairs and the door and frame into the living room is historic, showing there was a previous stair here (it is not a cupboard door as the application suggests). A narrow box winder is believed to have gone here the same as the ones existing on the first and second floors of the listed building. The census of 1939 shows Burley Cottage was inhabited by a grocer his family and 2 servants. A photo provided by the applicant from the early 1900s shows Burley cottage is being used as a Grocers (with signs for tea, and tobacco being displayed outside). This again supports the fact that the shop and cottage above were never 2 separate dwellings as the applicants suggest.

Lastly, the rear downstairs wall is underground and has severe levels of damp, exasperated by the cement floor and the run off from the stone flagged public footpath. A poltice mix to dry out the walls (the same as being used in the restoration of Notre Dame) was recommended over a year ago, with a lime plaster and a low grade of nhl. As my comments stated, the use of NHLs was only permitted on this small severely damp wall, because the clients could not get access to the outside of the building with it being a public footpath and not owned by them. This stopped them putting in a French drain or getting the rear wall externally re-pointed and further works done to stop water running into the property from the footpath etc. The use of an nhl was only permittable to give the applicants time to try to assess the severity of the run off from the footpath, it would not stop the damp being driven into this wall externally and further explorations were needed. I have since spoken to Building Regs who said the applicants would need to submit a form to close the footpath and carry out the necessary works.

The rooflight to the front elevation is also not permittable and as requested should be moved to the rear to avoid a cluttered roofscape.

As I have stated in my previous comments the proposed works to the listed building will see a number of harmful additions which not only removes historic fabric from the listed building but creates further unnecessary additions and risks. The proposal to split the building in two requires a number of further additions to the listed building and separates the historic relationship between the shop and living quarters above. It also reduces the buildings optimum viable usage by splitting the building in two with a very small 2 room ground floor flat. This reduction in size has the ability to reduce the chances of the property being lived in and not used just for holiday cottages purposes. There are also concerns about the reduction in energy efficiency of this building by the use of a d.p.m, nhls and Tyvek vapour membrane to all the walls. It is therefore classed as substantial harm towards the setting of the listed building under para. 207 of the NPPF.

The proposal to re-point the building is welcomed and will help improve the thermal performance of the exterior walls. All mortar mix proposed should be based on a typical mix of a non-hydraulic quicklime mortar mixed at a ratio of 1:3 (dry non-hydraulic quicklime: sand) and include the method of application and finish.

From: Annabel Longfield-Reeve
Sent: Wednesday, October 4, 2023 5:20 PM
To: Jill Bastow
Subject: RE: ADD INFO TO ACTION FW: NYM/2023/0527, Burleigh Cottage, Brig Garth, Robin Hoods Bay E12540- Nymnp update details

Hi Jill,
Thanks for re-consulting me on this application.
The applicants have included a letter from the previous owner 'that at that time there was indeed no staircase from the ground to the first floor……sought and obtained planning permission, converted the ground floor to a kitchen and, at the same time and for the purposes of creating a properly domestic dwelling. had the current staircase installed. We have, alas, no photographs either of the exterior or of the interior to pass on, but are able as a matter of absolute certainty to confirm that, at the time of purchase, there was no staircase from the ground to the first floor, both the stairs and the kitchen having been installed.' Thank you for pointing out the 1986 application to me.
In this application Mr Took sought change of use for the ground floor commercial premises to be turned into residential with the rest of the property (the application shows, he did this before purchasing the property). Plans were sought for this change, however, Mr Took clearly states that None were needed as there would be no material alterations, hence no plans were needed (I am therefore at a loss to find LBC for the current modern staircase and why there would be no need to do any internal alterations - if the shop and cottage weren't linked already); I do however, still accept that this staircase is a modern addition.
My comments clearly state that no historic timbers or floorboards have been disturbed (as highlighted by the applicant) this means the link could only have gone in this position. This is also reinforced by my previous comments that the door, wall, door frame and stair landing on the first floor is historic. The same 1986 planning application also states by a planning officer that there is an internal link between the shop and the house above (before Mr Took purchased it). Once again it is an historic feature for shop owners to live above their properties. Where there is considered harm, it is down to the applicant to provide justification for this proposal, so far none has been provided for splitting the shop from the cottage above.
Secondly, I have gone into great detail about how to make a Listed Building more energy efficient, both in the pre-application, emails to the applicant and this LBC, including giving examples of tried and tested methods (seen in similar properties in Robin Hoods Bay). Listed Buildings are completely unlike buildings of modern construction and Historic England (the government advisor on energy efficiency on historic buildings) has shown that most of the common tried and tested techniques on the market today are not suitable for listed buildings. The agent has stated in this application that 'Our clients are very involved in the 'thermal efficiency' industry including its options for use on traditional buildings and they have provided me with good background'. As far as I am aware the applicants are involved in thermal efficiency in the Pharmaceutical business (if this is wrong then please let me know), however, if they would like to provide examples of any listed buildings they have worked on to improve the energy

efficiency, I would be more than happy to read through.

As a result, my previous comments are still relevant here, please refer to them.
Kind Regards
Annabel

Annabel Longfield-Reeve (She/her/hers)
Heritage & Conservation Officer

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

:
: www.northyorkmoors.org.uk

From:	
To:	Planning
Subject:	Comments on NYM/2023/0527 - Case Officer Mrs Jill Bastow - Received from Mrs Jude Wakefield at Fylingdales Parish Council, 38 Hinderwell Lane, Runswick Bay, TS13 5HR
Date:	21 September 2023 14:20:54

Fylingdales Parish Council would like to object for the same reasons given for planning application NYM/2023/0525.

Comments made by Mrs Jude Wakefield of Fylingdales Parish Council, 38 Hinderwell Lane, Runswick Bay, TS13 5HR

Preferred Method of Contact is Email

Comment Type is Object with comments

Objection

Burleigh Cottage is a grade 2 listed building in a prominent position in the Robin Hoods Bay Conservation Area. Therefore, this application has been determined in accordance with Section 16, 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Chapter 16 of the NPPF paragraphs 189, 194, 200, 201 and 202, as well as, Policy ENV11 of the North York Moors National Park Authority Local Plan (July 2020).

I am saddened to see the proposal for the subdivision of the listed building. As mentioned in my pre-application comments, the staircase to the ground floor is not historic but replaced a previous staircase (believed to be a box winder staircase). The landing, door and cupboard at the top of this modern staircase is historic and so it is believed the historic stair finished at the same location. There would have always been a staircase here historically to gain access from the shop (ground floor) to the upper floor where the owners lived). The presence of the rear door onto Jim Bells style meant the occupier could come and go from their private quarters without having to go through the shop below. The building would never have been split into a double cell shop on the ground floor and a cottage above as the application proposes. We must be mindful that splitting up a small listed building in such a way would make it less attractive in the future if it is re-sold (the ground floor suffers from a great amount of damp) and there is a general lack of amenity space if the building is split this way.

Externally, there are no concerns to the raking out of the Cementous pointing and its replacement with lime. The building suffers from a great deal of damp and so making the building more 'breathable' will help dry the stonework out immensely. The mortar mix proposed should be based on a typical mix of a non-hydraulic quicklime mortar mixed at a ratio of 1:3 (dry non-hydraulic quicklime: sand) and include the method of application and finish. Joints in stonework should be carefully raked out utilising hand tools narrower than the width of the joint to a minimum depth of 1½ times the width of the joint or until sound mortar is reached. Power tools including drills, grinders must not be used.

The application proposes 'The replacement of the steps for stone on the plans', this is questioned, further information is needed about this and what is being proposed here.

There are no concerns to the windows being refurbished sympathetically. A method statement will need to be provided as to what refurbishment works will be carried out and how (if the windows are to be removed).

Any replacement guttering in cast iron is not objected to. However, further details will need to be provided of the design of the new guttering (if not like for like).

Lower Ground floor – there are no objections to adding shutters to the shop front window (to the inside). Joinery details are needed, the design should be sympathetic to the age of the property. Underfloor heating is not objected to on the lower ground floor as the floor has already been screed out with cement. The removal of the blockwork toilet cubicle on the lower ground floor is also not objected to as well as the creation of a new downstairs toilet.

As mentioned on site we would not want to see a dpm or dpc being used. There is the presence of an injectable one already and this is believed to have been contributing significantly to the damp in the property. We would recommend this being removed; however, we would not support any further being added as it is not tackling the water ingress but rather pushing it further up the walls. The Rear wall on the lower ground floor is below ground and so water ingress from the pathway is

causing some of the damp in this wall. We would not support a percolation mesh membrane being used or a vapour membrane fixed to the walls. These will stop the property from being breathable and contribute significantly to the damp. As mentioned in my pre-app comments the removal of the cement pointing, cement flooring and the dpc is key to getting this building back to being dry again, as well as repairs to the guttering and some extra guttering additions. If possible a French drain should be assessed with North Yorkshire Council to the rear of the property.

There are no objections to boarding the ground floor out with Themafleece Cosywool/Ultrawool/NatraHemp with a lime plaster finish with hemp fibre added. The application mentions 'Existing internal stone walls are generally to be kept as existing and cleaned down, repointed with lime plaster and made good., then only sealed if essential'. Sealing the walls is objected to as it will cause further damp problems. The limecrete floor as per Detail A on the proposed plans is not objected to and is sympathetic to the property.

Proposed on the ground floor; (as mentioned in pre-application discussions) 'The removal of the chimney breast on the first floor would be objected to, It would be assessed as less than substantial harm because it alters the original floorplan and removes an historic chimney breast. The presence of a chimney breast in a room, dictates the previous importance of the room. Historically only higher status rooms had fireplaces'. Unfortunately, I cannot see any justification for its removal. The insert is modern and so its removal is supported however the chimney breast must remain in place.

Any doors proposed to be removed need joinery details as well as clear and convincing justification as to why they need to be removed. The two internal doors on the ground floor are historic and so their removal should be resisted. The exterior door on this floor, is a modern addition and so is suitable to be removed with either a like for like batten door or 4 panelled timber door (joinery details needed).

On the ground floor and first a number of the wall finishes is in lime plaster with a 'rough' finish. Any proposed needs to be of this same finish as it is an historic feature. It is supported that any cement patch repairs are removed however, there is no justification for internal insulation to the ground, first and second floors. The walls to the property are thick stone walls and so will have good insulating properties (minus any cement plaster). There are also a number of historic features, skirting, door frames, cupboards, window frames etc that will be damaged by the proposal. Only new lime plaster is acceptable on these walls with no internal insulation. The removal of the arched alcove shelving is not objected to. The removal of the cupboard at the top of the stairs and the wall (to the ground floor stairwell) would be classed as less than substantial harm (as per my pre-application comments); these are historic features and no justification has been provided for their removal.

The suspended floor (Detail C) will keep the original timbers underneath and will put a suitable breathable insulation on top. As long as the new floor cuts around any historic skirting and not into it, the works will be classed as reversible and so there would be no objection. The window seat on the ground floor – joinery details are needed.

On the first floor on the plans the re-building of the bathroom wall and re-modelling of the two bathrooms is not objected to as these are modern additions (1960s). The wall insulation is objected to (see above). The removal of the cupboard next to the fireplace is objected to, it is an historic feature to match the fireplace in this room and must be retained. The staircase is proposed on the plans to 'Stair is in need of a full overhaul. All replacements to be formed in timber. Make good existing guarding to landing'. The stairs (apart from the lower ground floor) are historic and so any

proposed works to them need to be set out clearly in this application, with justification provided should any treads need to be removed and why they cannot be repaired.

The removal of the window to the loft is not objected to providing the replacement is in timber slim line double glazing, with through glazing bars (joinery details needed).

The plans propose that 'Joinery Replacement skirtings and architraves to be natural timber finish, oiled'. This is objected to, a clear assessment of each skirting and architrave in each room is needed, assessing the age and location (pictures needed). Justification is needed for their removal and any details of new replacements need to be included and approved.

The attic room currently has two windows and so we would not support a conservation rooflight on the front elevation of the listed building. We would however, support one to the rear away from the main street-scene of the Conservation Area.

The roof insulation is not objected to. The roof has been internally boarded out at one time (not historically). The insulation proposed is breathable and so there are no concerns with the proposal.

Finally, as highlighted in the pre-application discussions:

There is a damp problem around the exterior walls of the cottage (this is usual for cottages in the village with higher ground levels). We would recommend the following things:

The Guttering is checked, repaired and or replaced. If the guttering is too thin or failed in anyway, we would support a more efficient system to get the rainwater effectively away from the property.

There are significant amounts of cement mortar in the pointing of the stone walls as well as cracks in the mortar. Damages in the pointing draws water in through capillary action. This leads to the deterioration of the stone and accelerates water ingress. We would advise that the building is repointed in a hot lime mortar mix. Lime based mortars promote evaporation from wind driven rain penetration, which being in a coastal area with a strong north wind, will explain for some of the damp problems.

The ground floor appears to have been tanked out at one point. The ground floor now has a cement floor, we would advise that this floor is removed and a limecrete floor installed. A breathable floor with a Geotextile membrane installed first then, a foam glass aggregate in between and limecrete above should retain enough of the damp and diffuse it into the building. A Capillary break is the most important aspect here for stopping any ground water levels (foam glass aggregate). A cement floor just holds damp or moves it into the walls of the building.

For the internal walls in the building as a whole, we would only support new lime mortar being used to re-plaster the walls. The plasterer would have to pay careful attention to match the patina of any of the walls which have a 'rough texture'; which is traditional of historic plastering techniques. We would only support internal insulation in the downstairs corner utility room, which has been stripped of any previous historic internal fabric and goes straight down to the bare stone walls and cliff face.

The interior of the ground floor utility room shows a good amount of damp on the walls. We realise that the house is currently not lived in and getting it regularly heated will improve any damp conditions vastly. However, the walls to this room have a good amount of cement mortar, we would want to see this being removed and the walls left to dry out. We have seen the use of a lime rich mortar being slaked onto the walls and left for about a week to 'absorb' any damp in the walls, then removed. This process can be done a number of times until the wall is sufficiently dry (your builder

should be able to advise). Ideally, it should have some time to dry out as much as you can. We recommend using de-humidifiers whilst this drying is going on. I would then recommend plastering with a lime mortar, I would try a 1:1:6 (CL90:NHL5 (st astier): sand (not soft builder sand), you could try 1:3 Quicklime: sand with a gauge of argrical 1000 or brick dust, about 10% of the dry quicklime (makes it 5% of the total mix). I wouldn't normally advocate the use of NHL but with the dampness in the wall, it's probably going to struggle to set if you use purelime. And there should be enough free lime to help it deal with the moisture that is going to have to come through the wall. The lower ground floor rear wall is the only wall we would advocate NHL5 to (before insulation is added).

I would cover it this wall with a limewash slaked from pure quicklime. You can add pigments to the water before you slake it if your client wants some colour at this stage or paint manufacturers like F&B do limewash with colour added. This should help the plaster below to cope with the moisture. Ideally you shouldn't put this on until the plaster has started to set though. Don't paint the walls.

At present, the application would be assessed as substantial harm to the listed building under paragraph 201 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This includes the subdivision of the listed building, the removal of the historic features such as doors, door frames, walls, cupboards, staircase, chimney breast, and the boarding out of all the rooms (removing skirting, cornice etc). This proposal would remove all the character and patina of the listed building and change its internal setting to that of a house of modern construction. There has been no justification provided for any of these harmful works. Listed buildings can be made more energy efficient without this level of damage and so we would recommend the windows and doors being draught sealed (draughts account for up to 30% of heat loss), the floor, ceiling and roof insulated and the windows having secondary glazing applied or shutters. To make the building dry and warm (a cold wet building is significantly less thermally efficient), the guttering needs to be fixed, new additions applied (driving the rainwater outlet away from the walls) and the pointing re-done in lime; as well as the removal of the cement on the internal walls and floor. All his would make a significant contribution towards the thermal efficiency of the listed building, at this stage we would ask for an EPC rating to be done. After all the above-mentioned works, the stone walls are so thick that if they are dried out properly, internal insulation has the potential to hinder the thermal efficiency of the stone walls and so would not be needed in the listed building.

Listed Buildings are irreplaceable resources, we must remind the applicant of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings approach set out by William Morris; that Repair is always preferred over any Restoration (leading to replacement) works. We therefore ask the applicant to look to the building and see what can be repaired and kept and not removed and replaced with new features of an historic style.

ALR