

Mr. Nigel Sutterby  
The Manse  
Thorpe Bank  
Fylingthorpe, Whitby YO22 4UA

6 June, 2017

NYMNPA  
Helmsley, N. Yorkshire YO62

FAO: Mr. C.M. France  
Mrs. J. Bastow

NYM/2016/0696/FL Nigel Sutterby

Page 1/2

Dear Mrs. Bastow,

I wish to install dormer windows in the rear of my house for reasons of headroom, light & architectural improvement.

My original application has been summarily refused, and although Parks Officers have been both on site, & talking to my neighbour, nothing has been discussed with me.

The Manse has been variously described as "a Victorian Manse.. of outstanding character" and "high status...within the settlement" while possessing "unsympathetic alterations...(with)...low quality extensions to the rear".

Temporally, the buildings could never have been 'a Victorian Manse' ...the Methodist Church was not built until 1891.

Research shows that the edifice is originally 2 smaller cottages, with the 1920's lean to added after the, by then, one house was bequeathed to the Church in 1917.

'The Manse' reverted to Lay ownership in late 1960's.

At present, to the rear (north facing, overlooking fields) there are 5 different roof pitches & a crude 1960's flat roofed dormer.

I note, from the testimony, that there has been collusion between Officer Beth Davies & my neighbour John Legg, (subsequent to their site meeting) which has led to errors, inaccuracy & conjecture in Statements of Objection.

I feel this has been to my detriment, and I consider that the Director of Planning was not presented with a balanced & impartial argument, or correct facts.

Importantly, this 'view of the Manse' has been take in isolation, not in context of surroundings & neighbouring buildings. Photographs have been used which show houses on the opposite side of the road: no photographs showing the relationship between Grove Cottage (& its various unsympathetic alterations), & The Manse.

I have therefore undertaken factual corrections to their documents & include contextual photographs.

See attached:

Beth Davies 'Strong Objection' Rebuttal.

John Legg's 'Objection' Rebuttal.

Photograph showing context of front of Manse/Grove Cottage.

Photographs of existing views over Grove Cottage rear environs.

Photographs of dormer on 'Tamarind'.



Re. John Legg's Objection : Neighbour's 'privacy'...

I note, importantly, that no consideration has been given to the previous Determination NYM/2005/0855/FL..

"...Policy H8.....Burnside has 7 existing windows, which overlook the garden of the neighbouring property, (Grove Cottage) and the additional 3 windows are not considered to have an unacceptable increased impact on existing levels of overlooking or privacy."

I include photographs of views from our existing windows & conservatory, overlooking most of the rear of Grove Cottage environs; & showing the 8 overlooking windows of Burnside.

Summary:

I amend/resubmit my application to the following:

Replace /extend bathroom dormer (rear).

Construct bedroom dormer (rear).

Replace existing bedroom wooden Victorian sliding sash window with upvc. (w. side).

- 1) Bedroom & bathroom (rear) dormers will not adversely affect neighbour's privacy. Both rooms already overlook Grove Cottage & environs; as do several other windows & large conservatory. Headroom, in the rooms concerned, is presently only about 50% of floor area.
- 2) The existing view from the road is of a lean to roof, with one visible ugly flat dormer cheek.
- 3) My proposal will create a view from the road of a lean to roof, with one visible cat-slide dormer cheek.

The Manse and Grove Cottage are semi-detached, and stand alone, both bounded by their respective land to the east & west. Road to the south, fields to the north.

The rear (north) dormers, roofs etc. overlook fields & houses at some distance.

From this aspect I can count 10 dormers & 10 Velux rooflights.

One of these, similar in style to my proposal, has been fairly recently installed (south facing) in 'Tamarind'.

I think overall that my proposals are modest, reasonable & not detrimental to either the building, neighbours or the Conservation Area as a whole.

I am very willing to work with the Authority to arrive at architecturally pleasing solutions; however, I believe this current proposal addresses all aspects of form, size, massing & design detailing, including roof pitch, as exemplified in 'Design Guide' Part 2.

Yours sincerely

Nigel Sutterby



1) "encroach on the privacy to the rear of my property which has already been eroded .. by past developments."

There is no privacy existing to the rear of Grove Cottage.

The garden, to which he refers, is bordered by 50m of road and two overlooking properties.

Thorpe Bank - several windows of houses opposite have overview.

Burnside - uphill of the garden, has 7 original windows and 3 new windows, overlooking.

The Manse – already has the following overlook:

- Conservatory: 20 square metres (plus) of glazing; overlooks most of garden, greenhouse, summerhouse and into (his) conservatory.
- Rear bedroom (proposed dormer) existing window; overlooks into (his) conservatory, overview of patio, sheds and top of garden.
- Bathroom (proposed dormer) existing window; overlooks lower half of garden.
- Top bedroom Velux skylight; overlooks lower 2/3 of garden, greenhouse, summerhouse.

I bring your attention to a previous Determination : NYM/2005/0855/FL :

"Policy H8...Burnside has 7 existing windows, which overlook the garden of the neighbouring property. (Grove Cottage) and the additional 3 windows are not considered to have an unacceptable increased impact on existing levels of overlooking or privacy".

I contend, therefore, that the same ruling applies in the case of my proposed bedroom/bathroom (altered) dormers.

2) "Victorian Manse .. of outstanding character " ...

The Church use of the 'The Manse' dates from the 1920's, when the 2 original houses previously converted into one, had the rear brick extension built; until 1960's when it was sold by the Church.

The 'outstanding character' has been compromised over many years by several previous owners; and is further detracted from, by alterations to Grove Cottage adjacent : UPVC windows, road facing flat roof UPVC dormer, UPVC conservatory, 2 satellite dishes, flagpole, sheds, etc.

I note that from the points raised and wording of statements, that there has been significant collusion between Mr. Legg and Beth Davies.

I did observe their discussion, (from my conservatory) but Beth Davies did not attempt to visit me.

I perceive this as not impartial, and has led to inaccuracies & conjecture, to my detriment, as I do not feel that the Director of Planning was presented with an accurate contextual view or 'balanced argument'.



The Manse is a substantial historic building situated at the heart of Fylingthorpe Conservation Area on one of the principal routes through the settlement. The name 'Manse' suggests an historic association with a local church or chapel and this association would explain the high status of the original building which is evident in the slate roof (an imported material that cost more than more readily available pantiles), finely tooled stonework and imposing façade. The plans show a chimney at one gable end and the other within the body of the house, probably providing the staircase wall. The lack of any indication of the stacks on plan makes interpretation difficult although two flues to each chimney pot indicate heated rooms to ground and first floors with the attics probably unheated. The overall plan suggests the potential presence of servants' bedrooms on the top floor which reinforces the high status of the building within the settlement.

*The Manse is one of several properties in the vicinity, built in very similar style & materials, probably by the same builder, around the same time: all with similar attic spaces; possibly used as bedrooms.*

*The house is situated about 75 metres from the edge, not the heart, of Fylingthorpe Conservation Area.*

*Adjoining is Grove Cottage, with its own "unsympathetic alterations" including 2 satellite dishes, flagpole, sheds, upvc windows & upvc flat roofed dormer; south facing, overlooking & highly visible from the road.*

*Internal inspection & research shows that 'The Manse' was originally two houses, converted into one, prior to the addition of the rear extension. This is 9"x 3" brick, stretcher bond, cavity wall, 1920's construction.*

*Internally, walls have been moved, doorways bricked up or opened, windows opened into doorways, doorways changed to windows & staircases removed. Floor levels vary.*

*Fylingthorpe Methodist Church was not constructed until 1891: it is therefore highly unlikely that our building was ever a "Victorian Manse".*

*My investigations lead me to believe that the amalgamated original two buildings, with extension, became 'The Manse' in the 1920's, until sold into Lay ownership 1960's.*

In both architectural and historic terms the application site contributes significantly towards the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Unsympathetic alterations have been carried out, however, which detract from the streetscape. These include the replacement of the historic windows and addition of a projecting satellite dish on the front elevation, the construction of 2 poorly detailed roof lights on the main roof which stand proud of the roof line, a poorly detailed and positioned dormer window to the rear elevation which sits at the edge of the historic extension and further low quality extensions to the rear. These alterations might explain why, despite the high status and quality of the original structure, it has not been designated as a listed building.

*The historic (Georgian) windows have been replaced over time by Victorian sliding sash, which have been, in turn, renewed with similar style upvc.*

*There is one rooflight to the front, one to the rear; both are standard Velux & commonplace locally.*

*The majority of the historic alterations are to the rear, not visible from the streetscape.*

*The existing rear bathroom dormer is hideous 1960's flat roof & mineral felt; which I seek permission to replace for the benefit of mankind.*



A significant number of dormers and roof lights exist within Fylingthorpe but in the vast majority of cases these detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and serve as an example of the visual harm that can be caused by this type of development. Conversely the photograph below demonstrates how an original roof-scape devoid of visual clutter enhances the Conservation Area.



*This photograph shows the (North facing) street view, houses on the opposite side of the road, from an optimal angle, to suit the argument.*

*It does not show the cheeks of dormer windows to the South side, visible from the road, or the same dormers in plain view from public access Kingston Field & surrounding properties. More importantly, it does not illustrate any relationship between The Manse & (unsympathetic alterations to) Grove Cottage in context of the street view: specifically roofscape & existing dormer.*

*I have to disagree with the opinion that the "majority of dormers detract..." There are some very attractive ones visible from my windows...one of them constructed quite recently; although I heartily concur that the 1960's was not the best architectural period.*

The proposed plans demonstrate that dormer windows would totally undermine the original roof slope by introducing two lower pitch rooves which appear almost as 'wings' in profile. It is considered that any dormer window on The Manse would detract from the original architectural intention of the building and undermine its historic character. Combined with the existing rooflights the dormers would also add further

1

---

visual clutter to the roofscape. By undermining the architectural and historic character of a principal building at the centre of the settlement the proposed scheme would, in turn, undermine the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

*The original roof slopes will remain unchanged, and the "wings" are only visible on plan. Grove Cottage adjoins the west, trees to the east, fields to the north. There is no line of sight. The above has been omitted from the revised application.*

*The 2 original buildings have undergone various modifications and any "original architectural intention" and "historic character" are questionable.*

*I fail to see how "any dormer window on The Manse.....would undermine its historic character", and I fear that whatever "the original architectural intention" was...two houses perhaps ?....it is long lost in the mists of time & merely reflects Officer's personal opinion.*

Similarly the proposed continuous rear roof line undermines the architectural character and legibility of the historic building. The separation between the main roof slope and brick extension should be retained and therefore the guttering along the main roof. Removal of the existing as well as the proposed rear dormer is recommended. The existing gable plans are inaccurate and show the chimney incorporated within/sitting behind the existing dormer. This is misleading and fails to highlight that the proposed linear dormer will wrap around and therefore conceal the base of the attractive rear chimney.

*There is no plan for "continuous rear roofline". Existing angles are retained, with exception of cat slide dormers (common in vicinity).*

*The "guttering along the main roof" was removed when the brick extension was built (1920's): there is no evidence of gutter downpipe or fittings.*

*The "recommendation" that the existing (bathroom) dormer should be removed is unlikely to be followed unless permission is granted for a more visually pleasing and practical alternative, and is frankly, totally unrealistic.*

*Existing headroom is only about 50% of floor area. It would be nice to be able to stand when entering the bath.*

*The "attractive rear chimney" was constructed of new brick in 2004 & has no especial architectural merit.*

Finally the proposed lobby extension is very poorly designed and detailed adding visual clutter to the rear elevation whilst adding to the sprawling mass of extensions which pays no respect to the architectural character of the existing building or the wider Conservation Area. The flue will be visible from Thorpe Lane adding further visual clutter and detracting from views through the Conservation Area to the wooded valley bottom beyond. This carbuncle should be omitted from the proposed plans.

*The lobby (entrance) extension to the conservatory is at present 'board & batten', but could easily be changed to more suit the "visual clutter & sprawling mass" of the existing 1920's extension & (approved) upvc conservatory, facing open fields to the north.*

**The above carbuncle has been omitted from the revised application.**

*The "views through the Conservation Area" are limited to about 50 metres road length alongside, and over, the garden of Grove Cottage.*

*Speaking as a retired Professional Forester, I surmise that "The wooded valley bottom beyond" presumably refers to the ten or so, ivy-clad, immature trees in my garden.*

The only element of the application considered to be acceptable is the proposed replacement of the glazed roof to the modern, rear extension with slate. The applicant should ensure that the existing wall structure is capable of carrying the weight without external modification. Slate should be of a geology to match the original roof as this will be visible from Thorpe Lane.

*Permitted development. Partially visible for 50 metre road length, over hedge, along neighbour's garden boundary, across garden.*

*No further comment.*

