

161435-1453
aw

Wendy Strangeway

From: Cheryl Ward
Sent: 01 August 2016 09:21
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Hedgehog Barn, Explorer comments

To book in



From: Edward Freedman
Sent: 27 July 2016 13:02
To: Cheryl Ward
Subject: Hedgehog Barn, Explorer comments

Objection to proposed extension and alterations principally consisting of the addition of eight rooflights and the removal of the entire front wall of a section of the listed building.

Hedgehog Barn was converted from a two-storey barn and stable range in 1996. The buildings are listed GII in their own right as late eighteenth or early nineteenth century farm buildings, historically associated with Ivy Farm, adjacent. Conversion proposals went through several iterations before being implemented, initially in 1989 including just the two-storey barn with the adjoining stable range retained as an outbuilding. The 1996 scheme saw the complete L-shaped range converted to domestic accommodation to provide a substantial five-bedroomed house, and the construction of a large double garage. However, the design of the scheme was generally sympathetic to the agricultural character of the buildings, utilising existing openings and minimising the number of rooflights, which were limited to two to the rear elevation which were required for escape purposes to the first floor. Further rooflights had been proposed, totalling five, but three were required to be omitted by the case officer to make the scheme acceptable (see attd excerpt).

The current scheme seeks permission for the construction of a flat-roofed extension to the western end of the single-storey stable range; the removal of the front elevation wall of that section of the range to accommodate the extension; and the insertion of eight additional rooflights (which would total ten).

The extension would be harmful to the architectural character of the listed building by virtue of its relatively poor quality of design and materials, consisting of an extensive flat-roof protruding from the eaves level of the principal, south elevation of the stable range which is characterised by its dual pitch pantile roof and linear form; the use of GRP roofing material and timber cladding. In addition to the alien form and materials proposed the extension would not only obscure the linear form of the historic range but entail the complete removal of the south elevation of the stable cell which currently forms bedroom 5. The proposal would cause significant harm to the character and fabric of the listed building. Policy 132 of the NPPF states 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. ... As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification." In this case the property constitutes a substantial five-bedroomed and two-bathroomed house which has recently been sold, and it clearly provides practically and economically viable accommodation without the addition of an extension. Consequently no public benefit would be achieved by permitting the harmful extension.

The insertion of eight additional rooflights albeit conservation styles, would have a very harmful effect on the character and appearance of the listed building, detracting from the agricultural appearance of the existing front-facing roofscape which is currently unbroken by openings. The fixtures proposed would all serve rooms with existing windows, some with multiple windows, and therefore additional openings are neither necessary nor justified in terms of the impact on the character of the listed building. The proposal to replace the two Velux fixtures on the rear roofslope with conservation style fixtures would represent a modest enhancement, and in recognition of this a small third rooflight may be acceptable.

I do not believe that there is any potential to amend this scheme in a way that could overcome the objections to the principles of extension and the addition of large numbers of rooflights, and would therefore recommend that it is withdrawn or refused.

Edward Freedman
Building Conservation Officer

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

☎: 01439 772700
🌐: www.northyorkmoors.org.uk

Please note: my usual working days are Tuesday and Wednesday

Your ref:

Date: 31 July 1996

Our ref: MH/4/36/53G/LB

Dear Mr Duffield,

Listed Barn Conversion - Ivy House Farm, Aislaby

I refer to your letter received on 22 July 1996 concerning the above property. Your proposal is significantly different, in planning terms, from the original and a revised planning application and Listed Building application will be required. My comments on the revised drawings are as follows:-

1. All soil vent pipes should be contained within the building.
2. Details of the west elevation including the new barn will be required as will details of the north elevation.
3. I am concerned at the proposed use of 5 rooflights in a listed building. As a general rule I would normally expect to see no more than two on the whole building. As the utility already incorporates a door and window, I consider this is an unnecessary alteration. I would also wish to see a reduction of rooflights in the east facing roofslope down to two. Your comments about the omission of a window in the western elevation are noted but even with the omission of one rooflight from the eastern slope this still amounts to three overall. The remaining three rooflights should be conservation rooflights as the principle bedroom window and stairs may be sufficient to meet any fire regulations. You should liaise with Building Control and the Fire Officer.
4. Can you confirm that the internal division between the kitchen and living room is the original?
5. Can you provide details of the proposed balance flue for the LB application?
6. I will require details of the garage and fuel tank proposed.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Mr Mark Hill
Area Planning Officer



