

PETER GAZE PACE
AA Dipl, FSA, ARB, AABC
Architect
The Old Rectory, Scrayingham. York YO41 1JD
01759 371 771 or 07932 107 071
E-mail peter@peterpace.co.uk

**THE FEVERSHAM MEMORIAL
and THE WAR MEMORIAL**

**CONDITION REPORT
with
RISK ASSESSMENT**



The Feversham Memorial South West

Prepared for

HELMSLEY TOWN COUNCIL

by

Peter G. Pace Architect

JUNE 2015

Accredited in Building Conservation
Architects Registration Board No. 046824J
VAT Reg No. 599 1425 00

The Feversham Memorial and the War Memorial Helmsley.

1. **Location** – The Feversham Memorial to the Second Baron Feversham is set in the centre of Helmsley Market Place. Map ref SE 6183
- The War Memorial is set close by on the south west boundary of All Saints Church Helmsley churchyard.

2. **Commission** – This report is commissioned by Helmsley Town Council, to assess the condition of the structures, and advise on measures to reduce risk of damage or injury by the public.

3. **Author** -The report has been prepared by Peter G. Pace, an architect specialising in Ancient Buildings, and an Accredited Architect in Conservation. Projects include works at Castle Howard, Duncombe Park, and numerous Historic Building on behalf of Historic England, Natural England, The National Trust, North Yorkshire Moors National Park Authority, and several Dioceses in Yorkshire and Lincolnshire.

4. **Limitations** – This inspection has been limited to a visual inspection from ground level, and no testing of fixings has been undertaken. Where a closer inspection and tests are deemed necessary, this is mentioned in the report.

5. Description and History of the Monuments –

a) The Feversham Memorial – This memorial was built in 1867 to the design of Sir G.G. Scott with the Statue by Matthew Noble. The Canopy is in sandstone, and the statue in limestone.

The monument is listed Grade II* (see Appendix)

b) The War Memorial –



This was erected to honour the dead from the First World War, with a likely date of 1920. The designer is unknown, but may well have been Temple Moore who undertook many commissions in the Helmsley area for his two influential patrons, Rev. Charles Norris Gray, and Lord Feversham. If so this would have been one of his last commissions as Temple Moore died in 1920 (though the practice continued under his nephew). The Memorial is not separately listed, but as it stands within the curtilage of the Grade II* listed All Saints Church, it is deemed to be II* .
On the steps inscriptions have been added for the fallen in 1939-45 Second World War.

c) As both monuments are listed at a high grade, there are strict limitations on what alterations might be considered acceptable to increase protection and security.

6. THE FEVERSHAM MEMORIAL : Condition Report -



South West



South



West



North

a) **The base** - This is constructed as a series of steps in very large pieces of solid sandstone. The steps have been lowered into position using a Lewis self-gripping tool, and the mortice holes used to insert the Lewis have been filled with very hard cement.



The sandstone steps have worn considerably from excessive wear from persons climbing the steps. They are also much used as a form of seating. The unevenness of the steps with the deep dished centre is not causing trouble as might be experienced where the steps were part of a staircase with foot traffic up and down. Here the movement of pedestrians is very limited with no opportunity to stumble down at speed, though of course anyone could lose their footing if not paying attention. The raised up mortice fillings are a possible trip hazard, but could be reduced by grinding down so they are flush with the top going of the step. Generally the steps are of sufficient weight and size as to be stable. A few open joints should be repointed to help reduce water penetration, and reduce the risk of frost damage in winter months.

b) **The lower plinth –**

The lower part is formed as a series of stepped blocks with angled edges, making them difficult but not impossible to climb



The top section contains a flat panel of stonework, which on the South side contains an inscription



The centre of the inscription has been renewed in the last 30 years, and all appears to be firmly fixed.

c) Centre section – Statue canopy –

This part of the structure is really formed by four large corner buttresses. They show no signs of outward thrust, as the canopy above is formed of large pieces of stone, which are most likely tied together across the joints with metal cramps.



The stone work is dirty, due to past industrial pollution carried from the west riding and deposited on the stone by the rain. Sandstone allows pollutants to stick to its surface where exposed, but beneath sheltered overhanging parts where the rain does not reach, the stone remains unstained, thus producing a patchwork of staining.

The limestone statue is different, in that not only is it sheltered, but limestone reacts differently to rain. Dirt is not able to adhere so easily to limestone as the rain dissolves the limestone making it self-cleaning, except – in opposite to sandstone – where sheltered and not washed by the rain, deposit can accumulate. Fortunately in this case the statue is relatively clean.

The dirt on the sandstone will include sulphurous deposits which over a long period will cause deterioration to the sandstone. At present the effects are slight, and with the Clean Air Act further industrial deposits are unlikely to accumulate as they have in the past. Ideally some cleaning could be carried out to return the architectural composition without the distraction of staining, but the priority is not high from a technical view point- although aesthetically there is much to recommend it.

A closer survey by a Stone conservator is required to confirm the position.

For the present the dirt is not affecting the structural integrity of the monument, nor does there appear to be any loss of the detailed carvings, where in some instances of chemical erosion small pieces can drop off causing a hazard to persons below.

d) Upper section –

The top section is formed with a profusion of decorative stonework, with corner finials, cusping, naturalistic foliage and crocketing. In the apex is a two light cusped opening with quatrefoil tracery, heavily crocketed, flanked by finials and surmounted by a cross.

In the early 1990's the monument was repaired by K. Dodworth, master mason, and much of the decorative finials were renewed, and the longer sections of shaft secured using nonferrous dowels and ties.

Finial renewed



The new pieces of stone are distinguishably as they are much cleaner!

Whilst it is reasonable to assume this major repair programme dealt with the problems at the time, it must be stressed in 30 years further deterioration may have occurred. Whilst there are no visual signs of fractures it is possible some joints may have weakened.

In Victorian times the most common form of strengthening stone work was to embed ferrous metal cramps which will rust and expand over the years and are responsible for much damage to ancient stone work. Below is an example from an 18th Cent Monument at Castle Howard :

>



George Gilbert Scott would almost certainly have used ferrous cramps, and although many will have been removed in the 1990 restoration to the outer decorative stonework, it is likely much will remain in the heavier sections of masonry. It is important to ensure joints are well filled with mortar to stop damp penetration into the central mass of masonry, leading to rusting of embedded ferrous metalwork.

Fortunately there does not appear to be a problem at present, but a closer look is necessary to determine this – using an hydraulic platform.
Even stainless steel dowel used in the 1990 repair work can work loose if the dowels were left smooth. The bond between Stainless steel and lime mortar is not good , and it is only in the last 20 years Stainless steel has had to be roughened to get a good grip. The fixings from 1990 therefore also need checking.

e) Summary –

The monument appears to be in reasonable condition, though the higher decorative elements and mass stonework requires closer inspection in order to verify the position. Access using an hydraulic hoist will be sufficient for the Architect to confirm the condition.

In term of reducing unauthorised climbing up the monument, it will be very difficult to implement any barriers or netting etc. in view of its high Listed Status. Some minimal interventions may be possible such a placing anti-climb gel set out of sight on the top ledge to the base, but generally everything else is very visible and would detract from the Architectural composition. Listed Building Consent would be needed for any alterations/additions, any this is unlikely to be granted without a very substantial case being made for the protection of the monument and the public.

7. THE WAR MEMORIAL - Condition Report :



South West face



South

The memorial is constructed of Sandstone, and formed from large blocks of stone. It has been well constructed with no sign of subsidence, which can be common in grave yards where generations of burials have taken place. It is also near a high retaining wall and trees are close by, all factors which can lead to disturbance of the footings.

The cross shaft is very tall, and it is likely this will be morticed into the base block rather than secured with metal. The apex canopy and the crucifix figure are on the other hand probably secured with metal dowels, but at this date the metal used may well have been phosphor bronze, as the problems with ferrous metal were well known at



this time. In that case the likelihood of expansion and fracturing of the stonework is extremely low, and there are no signs of such stress fractures.
Generally the memorial looks to be in excellent condition. However without a close look at the apex from a hydraulic platform, it is not possible to be absolutely certain.
In term of safety/ unauthorised access, this is a difficult memorial to climb, although not impossible.

Summary – The memorial is in good condition. As an important listed structure, any alterations would be difficult to carry out as Listed Building Consent would be needed and, without a very substantial case for giving the monument protection, this is unlikely to be granted.

Peter Pace
June 2015
