

MillsonAssociates

Design. Develop. Deliver.

Station Tavern, Front Street, Grosmont, Whitby, Yorkshire, YO22 5PA

Heritage Statement

Stephen M. Griffiths MScCHE MRICS

15/02/2016

16 FEB 2016



Contents

1	Listing
2	Proposed Works
3	National Planning Policy Framework
4	Local Plan
5	Appendix
	Photographs

1 Listing

- 1.1 List Entry Number: 1148749
County: North Yorkshire
District: Scarborough
National Park: North York Moors
Grade: II
Date first listed: 07.07.1989

GROSMONT FRONT STREET NZ 80 NW (north side) 3/130 Station Tavern GV II Public house. C.1835. For the Whitby and Pickering Railway Company, licensed to John Buttery. Bordered tooled sandstone on chamfered plinth; ashlar porch and tooled dressings. Timber boxed eaves and pantile roof. Central-entry plan with parallel wing offset at rear. 2-storey, 3-window front. 4-panelled door, partly glazed, beneath ogee-shaped lintel, in prostyle Doric porch with frieze and moulded cornice. All windows are large-pane casements with painted stone sills, those on ground floor ogee-headed beneath ogee-shaped lintels.

First floor and eaves bands. Overhanging eaves to hipped roof with end stacks rising from base of roof. Left return: 2 storeys and 2 windows, with 2-storey, 2-window parallel wing set back at left. Detailing of main part same as on front. Parallel wing has altered windows on both floors and flat coped gable-end parapet, ramped up on each side. When first built the building was known as The Tunnel Inn, and was possibly the first purpose-built building for the Whitby and Pickering Railway. RCHM, Houses of The North York Moors, p.136; fig.236.

Listing NGR: NZ8284205260

2 Proposed Works

2.1 Stone cleaning to front and left hand side elevation

The works have already been carried out to the following specification.

The system used to clean the stonework was the system proposed in our estimate, and comprised a "low pressure damp abrasive cleaning system" , my term for a machine sold to me as 'a farrow system' in November 2000 – but with some minor modifications. We used the very same machine to clean the 'North Face' of Scarborough' s Grand Hotel in about 2007, and indeed used the machine to clean the brickwork of the New Bridge signal box on the North Yorkshire Moors Railway at around the same time. The machine and technique was I think last scrutinised by a named conservation officer, in Beverley, this year 'Malte' (on [01482 393725](tel:01482393725)) – a change of personnel in the East Riding conservation team - regarding the Westwood Hospital re-development – who became an entirely satisfied conservation officer. Hull conservation officers - (Paragon Station, the 'immigrant station building' , the Cooperative Façade in Kingston Square, the Chinese Supermarket on the Corner of Union Street and Albion Street this summer and many others) and York conservation officers (the Assembly rooms on Blake Street and the building next door 'Museum Street Corner' , 26 (28 and 30) st Saviourgate, etc etc etc) are familiar with our machine and our work.

As I have said, I describe the machine as a damp abrasive cleaning system, it is similar to (although I believe more cost effective than) the JOS system. The blast pressure can be varied between about 2 bar and about 8, although our normal operating pressure is about 5 bar. Abrasive (in this case crushed recycled glass grit of sub 0.5 mm grit size (again our standard media)) is mixed with water in a blast pot, and additional water introduced into the blast pot to expel a corresponding volume of abrasive and water mix- it is this volume displacement that allows the machine to generate a consistent flow with low abrasive rates – unlike traditional grit or slurry blasting where abrasive flows purely under gravity, and high flow rates need to be maintained in order to achieve a consistent flow – there is

nothing worse for blast cleaning than a machine that dribbles then gushes abrasive at a surface – the operator cannot compensate rapidly enough. We use crushed glass as standard as our media as it rapidly breaks up on contact with the surface and has a relatively low density compared to the Olivine abrasive that Mr Farrow specified for his system in the first place (glass also has the advantage of not being a by product of Asbestos Mining!)

In this particular case, the dirt on the stone was very superficial, and a blast pressure of just 4 bar, and an abrasive consumption rate of less than 25kg per hour was entirely capable of removing the dirt, with no apparent loss of stone or pointing. If my employee has any doubt whatsoever (and given that he has been working for me for 12 years using the machine on an almost daily basis.

3 National Planning Policy Framework

3.1 128

In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage asset affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of details should be proportion to the assets important

and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should be consulted on the heritage assets assessed using an appropriate expertise where necessary.

Where a site in which development is proposed or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest local planning authorities should require the developer to submit an appropriate desk based assessment and, where necessary a field evaluation.

This building does have a prominent appearance within the village of Grosmont, particularly its association with the railway and is a popular tourism attraction.

3.2 129

The local planning authority should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by the proposals (including by development affecting the heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the Impact of a proposal on the heritage asset to minimise conflicts between heritage assets conservation and any aspects of the proposal.

The concept of the layout of the building has been unaltered except for the removal of internal walls in the past. We feel that the vernacular style of the building and its spacial quality is not being altered to any further detriment with the exception of small structural openings.

In conclusion we consider that the minimal harm to the historic fabric can be supported by the improved economic viability..

3. 131

In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

The stone cleaning was carried out on the basis of highlighting the building and sustaining its prominence and this was in association with a general refurbishment of the interior to provide bed and breakfast accommodation.

The refurbishment to the public house and the sand blasting was carried out to make the building look more attractive to support the economic viability.

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. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

There has been no harm to the building in the sense that its architectural detailing regarding the stone work has not been obliterated either the tooling or any dress surfaces sufficient enough to take away the importance of its character. Whilst it is accepted that from the independent report that the stone cleaning requires further work to make sure there are no remaining areas uncleaned. It still remains that there had been other buildings cleaned within the area, although it is accepted that the majority of the stone buildings remain uncleaned.

4 Local Plan

With reference to the Scarborough Local Plan 1999, the policy E25 change of use and alterations to existing buildings. We understand now this policy expired on the 27th September 2007 and no longer forms part of the development and consequently will not now be referred to in making decisions.

This in effect has been replaced by the National Guidance.

5 **Appendix**

Photographs



Figure 1 Building prior to stone cleaning front elevation.



Figure 2 Side elevation prior to stone cleaning.



Figure 3 Side elevation prior to stone cleaning.



Figure 4 Front elevation after stone cleaning.



Figure 5 Side elevation after stone cleaning.