

**Wendy Strangeway**

---

**From:** planning@northyorkmoors.org.uk  
**Sent:** 14 April 2016 16:35  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Comments on NYM/2016/0111/LB - Case Officer Mrs Ailsa Teasdale - Received from Building Conservation at The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York, YO62 5BP, Via Email: building@northyorkmoors.org.uk

Please see comments emailed on 14.04.2016

Comments made by Building Conservation of The Old Vicarage Bondgate Helmsley York  
YO62 5BP

Via Email: [building@northyorkmoors.org.uk](mailto:building@northyorkmoors.org.uk)

Phone: 01439 772700

Fax: 01439 770691

Email: [Building@northyorkmoors.org.uk](mailto:Building@northyorkmoors.org.uk)

Preferred Method of Contact is: Post

Comment Type is Object with comments

Letter ID: 454785

14 APR 2016



**Wendy Strangeway**

---

**From:** Ailsa Teasdale  
**Sent:** 15 April 2016 10:50  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: Staion Inn: Objection  
**Attachments:** Document2.docx



---

**From:** Beth Davies  
**Sent:** 14 April 2016 16:33  
**To:** Ailsa Teasdale  
**Subject:** Staion Inn: Objection

The application acknowledges that the building, 'has a prominent position within Grosmont particularly its association with the railway' but this statement, whilst true, fails to fully capture the intimate relationship between the listed Inn and the nearby railway.

Grosmont village developed in a direct response to the railway. It is believed that the Station Inn, which was purpose built by the Whitby and Pickering Railway in 1835, was the first structure to be built in the village which started life as a simple staging post. It was originally called the Tunnel Inn as there was no settlement; just the Inn which was encountered as approaching trains arrived through the nearby tunnel. The settlement that consequently developed around this staging post was also called Tunnel until as late as the 1850's.

The original name of both the Inn and the village are symbolic of the inextricable relationship between the built environment and the railway. The sooty patina that the cleaning work has removed was the accumulated evidence of the intimate relationship that the Inn and railway have experienced for the past 181 years. It was also evidence of the area's former industrial heritage which included blast furnaces, lime kilns and brick works; all of which would have burned coal in their manufacturing processes. This patina contributed significantly towards the building's local distinctiveness and accordingly that of the wider village; a non-designated heritage asset which has been recommended for designation as a Conservation Area.

The applicant states that the stone cleaning was carried out to 'sustain the building's prominence, make it look more attractive and improve its economic viability'. It is argued, conversely however, that the building now appears denuded and pale within the context of surrounding stone buildings that all still have a sooty patina. The cleaning work has undermined the building's local distinctiveness and the visual evidence of its life-long relationship with the railway thus undermining its significance, its historic interest and therefore its status within the streetscape.

Not only has the work adversely affected the historic character of the listed building, however, it has also undermined its special architectural interest. The independent report commissioned by the applicant to assess the work confirms that the abrasive cleaning work has eroded the high quality hand tooling of the masonry. This erosion is visible to the human eye and has resulted in a blurring of the tooling which has lost its former crispness. The porch, and subsidiary elevations, which do not appear to have been cleaned to the same degree as the front elevation, also now look different in colour and texture to the front and side elevation that have been cleaned undermining the architectural integrity of the structure.

The repercussions highlighted about contravene para 131 of the NPPF which emphasises the 'desirability of sustaining...the significance of heritage assets'.

Of further concern is the potentially increased threat of erosion the masonry now faces. The local calcareous sandstone develops a hard outer skin which protects the relatively soft inner stone. When this hard outer skin is eroded the softer inner stone can become prone to accelerated rates of decay. It is for this reason that the Authority always advises against the use of abrasive cleaning methods on sandstone structures within the National Park. The applicant's assertion that because the system has been authorised in other areas it should be acceptable here demonstrates a lack of understanding about differing geologies and their relative strengths and ability to withstand abrasive cleaning techniques.



This photograph taken in 1982 shows the soot blackened inn in the context of a streetscape of neighbouring buildings with a similar patina.

Para 134 of the NPPF requires any harm caused to a heritage asset to be offset by public benefit. Whilst the applicant states that the works were intended to improve the economic viability of the Inn there is no evidence to suggest that the cleaning works have or will achieve this and it is argued that by undermining the Inn's architectural and historic significance the works have potentially had the opposite effect. In the light of the above refusal is strongly recommended. BD