

Wendy Strangeway

From: Planning
Sent: 02 November 2016 16:21
To: Planning
Subject: Comments on NYM/2016/0709/FL - Case Officer Mrs J Bastow - Received from Building Conservation at The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York, YO62 5BP, Via Email: building@northyorkmoors.org.uk

Please see comments emailed to 'Planning' on 2.11.2016

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

Via Email: building@northyorkmoors.org.uk

Phone: 01439 772700

Fax: 01439 770691

EEmail: Building@northyorkmoors.org.uk

Preferred Method of Contact is: Post

Comment Type is Raise Concerns

Letter ID: 466830



-2 NOV 2016

From: Planning
Sent: 02 November 2016 16:19
To: Planning
Subject: Comments on NYM/2016/0709/FL - Case Officer Mrs J Bastow - Received from Building Conservation at The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York, YO62 5BP, Via Email: building@northyorkmoors.org.uk

Although there is no objection in principle to the creation of annexe accommodation in this range of buildings the proposed scheme is considered to be excessive in its ambition. The proposals allow for the creation of a two bedroom unit with associated parking for two vehicles. This places excessive pressure on the range and its setting. None of the buildings are retained to provide external storage for the main house or annexe despite the fact that two new garden areas will be created by the scheme. There are concerns that this will lead to future pressure for a garden store within the setting of the listed range. There is a large storage building which was recently constructed to serve the main house but this is some distance from the house and a trailer, several fridges/freezers and logs are being stored in the outbuildings suggesting that the owners do benefit from having storage located more closely to the house. Even if storage for the main house is negated the annexe will require a garden store/tool shed/the equivalent of an attic which cannot be provided internally if the original roof structures are to remain visible. As well as creating future pressure for further structures the conversion of all cells within the range will detract from the agricultural, rural character of the site, especially at night when internal lighting will be visible through the glazed screens. It is therefore recommended that the accommodation be reduced to a 1 bedroom unit which should be sufficient as the application states that the annexe is designed to accommodate a single, elderly relative. The southerly cart shed should be used as a car port to reduce the need for extensive areas of hardstanding/parking beyond the eastern wall of the range which currently reads as the development limit. A parking area here would detract from the undeveloped, natural setting of the listed range. Vehicular access and turning here should be by means of twin tracks only with grass between to mitigate the impact. The porch, which is a domestic feature and correctly identified in the Heritage Statement as a likely area of concern, should be omitted. The Authority's Design Guide on the Re-use of Traditional Rural Buildings states on page 4 that 'insensitive and inappropriate conversions are often characterised by...introducing porches...and other alien features'. The proposed demolition of the solid wall between cells 1 and 2 should also be omitted. This element of the scheme is unjustified and will lead to loss of historic fabric and characterful, evidential detailing contained within the four niches. A standard internal connecting door would be an acceptable compromise as this would only necessitate the loss of one niche.

The use of cell 5 as a carport would preclude the need for the corridor in cell 4 thus minimising division of the existing internal space. It is recommended that cell three, which has the hipped roof, be retained as an open plan space as a kitchen-diner with the extant opening used as a back door. Cell 4 would become a bigger, possibly en-suite bedroom. Alternatively cell 1 is retained as an undivided space with a simple internal partition created in cell two to create a bathroom or bathroom and utility space with a sitting room beyond in cell 1.

Fenestration: The screen to cell 1 should be set back further to create the maximum reveal. 'Pinned back' doors are rarely successful and often add visual clutter whilst concealing historic masonry. The hinges would have to be replaced as none of the doors are currently designed to be pinned back and there is insufficient space in the corner of the yard for this approach. A cleaner approach would be to either fully glaze the openings with new, chunky frames set back in a deep reveal and painted a dark colour or to fix the bottom half the doors in place re-using the forged hinges to cell 4 with windows above (this might be the preferred option within the bedroom to create more useable floor space). A mixed approach to the doors would be acceptable.

The internal door between cells 1 and 2 is very characterful and should be retained. The bottom can either be repaired with spliced replacement timber or boarded over on each side which is a common vernacular treatment. Similarly the timber hayrack in cell 2 is very characterful and should be retained and re-used somewhere within the development (location to be specified).

The structural engineer's report states that substantial areas of re-building are required although the method/exact area is not stipulated within the application. This should be conditioned and should be specified by a conservation accredited architect. The need to completely rebuild the characterful boundary wall is questioned. A repairs approach would be preferred. Similarly the structural report recommends

wholesale replacement of the roof but there is no commentary in the application to clarify whether this is proposed or not. This approach would be strongly resisted and a repairs/consolidation approach should be taken instead. Treatment of the roof should be conditioned to address this issue. Finally the application states that solid floors and linings will be used to ward against flooding. Solid floors are acceptable in cells 2,3 and 4 where concrete floors are already in existence although limecrete flooring is recommended for breathability. Cell 1 has an earth and stone floor and this should be protected through use of a suspended floor. Wall linings should all be constructed of a reversible, breathable material such as fibreboard. Masonry linings should not be used.

Please condition: landscaping to eastern area/vehicular approach including boundary treatment, sectional joinery details, finish and glazing of doors and windows, type and size of roof light, wall linings, floor treatment to cell 1, repairs schedule for troughs, specification for any areas of re-building, schedule of proposed works to roof, retention and specified re-use of timber hayrack from cell 2.

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

Via Email: building@northyorkmoors.org.uk

Phone: 01439 772700

Fax: 01439 770691

Email: Building@northyorkmoors.org.uk

Preferred Method of Contact is: Post

Comment Type is Raise Concerns

Letter ID: 466830

