

From: [Helen Webster](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: FW: Rose Cottage, Grosmont
Date: 25 July 2018 17:46:44

From: Edward Freedman
Sent: 25 July 2018 16:06
To:
Cc: Alison McCarthy; Helen Webster
Subject: RE: Rose Cottage, Grosmont

Dear Louis

To improve mobility between the utility and kitchen can the opening be 2m not 1.5m. 2m was previously noted as an acceptable option.

I suggested a range of widths and without the benefit of seeing the effect on plan. I have now marked up a plan and 2m is the absolute maximum overall width we would permit, which will be slightly reduced by linings. I would maintain that a timber lining and architrave should be applied. The exposed pine lintels would not have been exposed historically and they appear rather anomalous.

The partition in the dining room is a key area where the applicant and myself are struggling to fully understand the justification of why this can't be removed. We discussed this at length on the phone and you agreed to consider a feature remaining, such as a nib or drop down from the ceiling.

Due to the apparent modern reinstatement of the historical partition and the history of change, I would compromise here with the construction of a downstand and nibs to both sides on the line of the partition. These need to be significant, at least 350mm below the bottom of the joists, and at least 300mm for the width of the nibs, which should be treated, as above, with lining and architrave. Having marked this arrangement on plan it would not prejudice access to the room from the kitchen.

In respect of the stone flags in the kitchen/utility, below is a link to the company/product the applicant proposes to use. If you could clarify if this is acceptable at this stage without conditioning approval of samples that would be well received given the 6 week lead time and difficulty with getting a sample.

The first, second and fourth images on the linked page do not look like the traditional 'York stone' colour range, having pinks and reds within it. The third looks better as a more consistent grey, but photographs can be deceptive. Providing a more regular grey flagstone can be provided then this will be acceptable, but please provide some form of confirmation of this from the supplier.

Actually, neither the NPPF nor the heritage policies of the NPPF are permissive of harmful works to listed buildings on the basis of private needs, and the revised version of the NPPF has clarified that whether the harm is of a substantial or less than substantial nature it requires strong justification. (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 (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification" paras.193 & 194.) Nevertheless, it's helpful to understand the rationale for the proposals. I do wonder how your current scheme will address the access needs of Mr McCarthy's mother as it removes any opportunity (in the "library" or the scullery) for ground floor toilet or bathroom facilities, but clearly this isn't a matter that influences my advice.

Kind regards

Edward Freedman
Senior Building Conservation Officer