

**From:** [Ailsa Teasdale](#)  
**To:** [Planning](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 10 South End  
**Date:** 06 December 2017 13:15:36

---

**From:** David Carruthers  
**Sent:** 06 December 2017 12:12  
**To:** Ailsa Teasdale  
**Subject:** FW: 10 South End

NYMNP

06/12/2017

**Ailsa**

**My final comments.**

**Thanks**

**David**

### **10 South End, Osmotherly**

10 South End is significant for its inclusion on the National Heritage List for England at Grade II. The house itself is mid-18<sup>th</sup> century with 19<sup>th</sup> century alterations. The associated coach house, outbuilding and pig sty appear to be later incremental additions. I would make it clear, however, that the outbuildings are considered part of the statutory listing and not curtilage listed as stated in the Design and Access Statement. The proposed development site is also significant as it sits within the Osmotherly Conservation Area and makes a positive contribution to character and appearance. As a whole the asset exhibits various degrees of Evidential, Historical, Aesthetic and Communal values as defined by Historic England in *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance (CPPG)*.

Although the Heritage Impact Assessment states that the 'development will have a number of physical impacts on the designated building which will result in both positive and negative impacts' the only positive I can deduce is the repair of the historic fabric. As CPPG states, however, in paragraph 153:

*[...] The fact that a place is neglected should not, of itself, be grounds for agreeing a scheme that would otherwise be unacceptable.*

The demolition and loss of historic fabric proposed, in conjunction with the extensions are all completely unacceptable in conservation terms. The alterations will harm the assets significance by reducing Evidential, Historical and Aesthetic value. The proposed extensions are unacceptable because they destroy the distinctive hierarchy of scale and massing that is currently contributing to the overall significance of the asset. The wholesale demolition of the pigsty is particularly surprising as is the raising and widening of the west gable which are all notable features. At present evidential and historic value is quite easily analysed, for instance, with the blocked doorway in the coach house but even this is proposed to be swept away to create a wider garage opening even though one already exists in close proximity. In terms of style the 'suburban' appearance of the proposed rear extensions is also an uncomfortable addition in this context.

The dominance of the principal dwelling and the gradual diminishing in scale of the subservient agricultural buildings is assessed as a major contributor to significance. A more sensitive scheme is required that retains this hierarchy of massing along with the distinctive character differences between the 'residential' and 'agricultural' elements.

The Heritage Impact Assessment also has a whole section on setting impacts, relating to the development proposals. The NPPF, however, makes it clear that the setting of a heritage asset is the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3, recommends a broad approach to assessment, undertaken as a series of steps and Step 1 is to 'identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected'. If we apply Step 1 there are two principle heritage assets under consideration here; namely the Osmotherly Conservation Area and the listed building itself which are both directly affected by the proposals. In my opinion, and having due regard for the definition in the NPPF, the 'setting' of these assets will not be affected by the proposals. Consequently there is no reason to proceed to the next steps of assessment as the setting of the principal assets will not be affected.

There are other listed buildings in the vicinity, and there is the potential for their setting to be affected by the proposals, but that assessment is not necessary for the purposes of this response.

It should be noted that a sensitive scheme of conversion and repair would have been considered in a positive light but unfortunately this is not considered a sensitive scheme and should be refused. The main justification for the works, in terms of countering a negative impact on significance, appears to be based on maintaining the building in use and this, as stated above, is not considered sufficient reason.

David Carruthers  
Conservation Architect

(Please note my normal working days are Tuesday and Wednesday)