

**From:** [Harriet Frank](#)  
**To:** [Planning](#)  
**Subject:** FW: NYM/2018/0331/LB & 0329/FL Rose Cottage Fylingthorpe  
**Date:** 11 July 2018 11:04:36

---

From: Edward Freedman  
Sent: 10 July 2018 16:36  
To: Harriet Frank  
Subject: NYM/2018/0331/LB & 0329/FL Rose Cottage Fylingthorpe

Dear Harriet

Heritage interest:

Rose Cottage is a politely-designed village house dating from the late eighteenth century of significant architectural quality, exemplified in its fine herringbone tooled sandstone construction, symmetrical 4-windowed front elevation, use of vertical sash windows and finely-detailed front door set design. It largely retains its historic floorplan except for the addition of two lean-to extensions to the rear in the latter half of the twentieth century. These are of modest size and well-proportioned in relation to the host building. The building is very attractively-situated on the corner of Thorpe Green Bank and Middlewood Lane, meaning that all elevations are visible within the streetscape - particularly due to its elevation above the road level, and surrounded by a handsome stone boundary wall. It possesses strong architectural interest (aesthetic heritage values) due to its design, form and materials; and historical interest (historical illustrative values) as a well-preserved example of a small polite Georgian house within Fylingthorpe.

Proposals, assessment of impact and recommendations:

1. Extension: The proposed extension would relate poorly to the character of the listed building due to its extension beyond the western gable of the building; its projection beyond the northern wall of the existing two-storey lean-to; the excessive length of its shallow-pitched roof; and the poor relationship of its window designs to the existing building. These elements would in combination result in an incongruous addition that would detract from the architectural character of the listed building. Internally it would result in a kitchen which was larger than any other room in the house which would undermine the historic spatial character in terms of the balance between the original rooms and the modern service accommodation. I am unable to suggest any amendments which would make this extension acceptable due to the size of the footprint proposed, and consequently I would object to this extension and recommend that it is omitted.
2. Window 20 to upper gable: The proposed window would be harmful to the architectural character of the gable end. A single off-set gable window is characteristic of traditional buildings, but gables are traditionally relatively blank and multiple windows, particularly in the same floor, are unusual. In this case, the gable is narrow, the existing window is already large and the addition of a second window in such close proximity would appear intrusive, particularly in the prominent location proposed (see attd image). It would also cause harm to the fine quality stonework. I would object to this window and recommend that it is omitted.
3. Rooflight: The proposed rooflight would be within the rear roofslope where rooflights are traditionally located. A pair of rooflights would not appear excessive. Providing it matched the existing fixture I have no objection to this addition.
4. En-suite bathroom: The addition of an ensuite bathroom as proposed would not compromise the character of the attic space and I have no objection to this addition.

Para. 132 of the NPPF advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Para 134 advises 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, including securing its optimum viable use. In this case, the proposed extension

and window would cause harm to the heritage significance of the heritage asset. Any benefits of the development would be private in nature and consequently should not be considered as justifying any level of harm. Accordingly, I would recommend refusal of the application if the extension and window proposals are not omitted.

[<https://s3.britishlistedbuildings.co.uk/lbimg/101/148/708/101148708-208295-800.jpg>]  
<<https://s3.britishlistedbuildings.co.uk/lbimg/101/148/708/101148708-208295-o.jpg>>

Thanks

Edward Freedman  
Senior Building Conservation Officer

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

\*: 01439 772700

\*: [www.northyorkmoors.org.uk](http://www.northyorkmoors.org.uk)<<http://www.northyorkmoors.org.uk/>>

Please note: my usual working days are Monday to Wednesday