

HWE

Kelsey Williamson

From: Planning
Sent: 03 May 2017 17:38
To: Planning
Subject: Comments on NYM/2017/0155/LB - Case Officer Miss Helen Webster - Received from Building Conservation at The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York, YO62 5BP,

See email to HW 3/5/17

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

Preferred Method of Contact is: Post

Comment Type is Object with comments
Letter ID: 476141



Kelsey Williamson

From: Helen Webster
Sent: 04 May 2017 09:30
To: Planning
Subject: FW: NYM/2017/0155/LB Hollington



From: Edward Freedman
Sent: 03 May 2017 17:37
To: Helen Webster
Subject: NYM/2017/0155/LB Hollington

I have **strong concerns** with several of the proposed works. Hollington is listed as likely to date from the early nineteenth century but I suspect that while its current plan form and much of its masonry may date from the early nineteenth century, the use of chamfered stone window surrounds evident in the gable elevation suggests that it may have seventeenth/eighteenth century origins.

First floor structure: the existing joists are attractive, exposed historic timbers, with the underside of the floorboards above with their characteristic pencil-mould to the tongue exposed to view. The floorboards are relatively narrow but nevertheless in my view likely to date to the later nineteenth century. No engineer's report is submitted with the application but I cannot see the justification for the radical intervention to the construction of the floor structure proposed, which would have a very harmful effect on the internal architectural and historic character of the listed building. The existing floor may be springy, and the timbers undersized for modern construction, but this is a characteristic of historic floor constructions. The insertion of much larger sized joists side by side with the original joists as shown in section a-a would appear wholly incongruous (actually it would look absurd). I fail to understand the proposed fitch plate detail: my understanding of this technique is to insert steel plates into solid timbers to provide a strengthened core or to insert steel plates either side of solid timbers and bolt through, but the drawing (section a-a) does not appear to illustrate either of these applications. The proposal to underdraw between the joists is also unacceptable: the decorative treatment of the underside of the floorboards shows that the ceiling was always exposed as would be characteristic of such vernacular buildings, and obscuring the ceilings as proposed would diminish the internal character of the building.

Beam No.1: The insertion of an enormous beam in the position of the existing partition between lounge and kitchen is wholly unacceptable. It would represent a clumsy intrusion both visually and in terms of the alterations required to the existing partition studs. Again, the justification for the beam is unclear. The partition provides some support to the joists, and if required this could be strengthened to provide additional support in a much more discreet manner.

Partition lounge/kitchen: The existing stud partition is likely to date from an early stage in the building's history, perhaps the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century. The irregularity of the studs suggests they date from prior to the use of regular sawmilled timbers which happened later in the nineteenth century. It clearly demarcates the original plan form of the current iteration of the building, separating the front room/parlour from the scullery/kitchen to the rear, and affording the main room of the house the regular proportions characteristic of historic buildings of this nature, roughly square with a focus on the centrally-

located fireplace. Some of the existing studs have been altered to accommodate a hatch between kitchen and lounge, but otherwise the partition is intact, with original doorway, and extending right up to the underside of the ceiling in their original arrangement. The removal of studs as proposed would be harmful to the plan form, sense of enclosure of the main room and historic fabric, and would not preserve the architectural significance of the listed building. There is no justification for the alteration of the partition, the existing kitchen is sufficiently large for a house of this small scale and could accommodate modest dining within the space or the serving hatch could be maintained to facilitate dining in the lounge. The existing partition should be repaired and re-plastered using lath and lime plaster, the residue of which is evident on the studs.

Other matters: No objection to removal of modern fire surround but a suitable replacement should be made: the fireplace is a focal point of historic rooms and it is important that a surround is reinstated. A very simple board and moulding similar to the first floor room could be used. I note reference to treatment of doors and joinery with fire-proof paint. This is fine but please note no doors or any other historic fixtures not explicitly referred to in the application may be replaced. With regards to the proposed dormer window design, if the existing dormer structure is to be replaced it is important that a traditional appearance is achieved which may require insulation standards to be relaxed. Please request 1:5 drawings showing the proposed constructional details, aiming to minimise the bulky appearance of the existing dormer cheeks as far as possible.

I would recommend that unless the first three items are omitted or substantially revised for acceptable proposals this application should be refused.

Edward Freedman
Building Conservation Officer

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



☞: www.northyorkmoors.org.uk

Please note: my usual working days are Tuesday and Wednesday