

**NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS**

Date: 16th July 2024

NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 5pm on the day before committee. Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7 & 8	24/01938/FUL & 24/01939/LBC	Agent

Following comments of Historic England revised plans have been submitted by the agent showing what the agent considers 'a more visually subservient garage.'

The revised plans show the dormer windows have been omitted and the ridge and gable apex heights reduced.* As the dormers have been omitted, three roof lights have been added in the eastern elevation and one within the western elevation.

*The ridge height has been reduced by 300mm and the gable apex height by 500mm

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7 & 8	24/01938/FUL & 24/01939/LBC	Historic England

Historic England have responded in relation to the revised plans as follows:

'I concur with you [officers] that whilst the revision (ie removal of dormers as shown in the attached plan) is welcomed, it doesn't deal with the fundamental concerns with regards to siting, proximity and scale so generally agree with your [officers] recommendation with regards to harm to the setting of the grade II* listed building.'

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7 & 8	24/01938/FUL & 24/01939/LBC	Agent

Agent additional comments:

It would appear from the consultee comments that they have not noted the substantial reduction in height of our garage proposal, where the apex of the gables is now half a metre lower than that previously submitted.

I would also challenge their appraisal of the siting and setting of this proposal as none of the consultees has visited the site and as you can see from the attached images, the proposed garage would be all but invisible. Again this would be obvious from a site visit.

We have made every effort for the proposed garage to be a suitable and reticent partner to the main house and as it is impossible to site this anywhere else around the site, we feel that this would be the best location. Despite Historic England's arbitrary ruling there are many locations where a subordinate building may be successfully adjacent to the main house without causing harm.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7 & 8	24/01938/FUL & 24/01939/LBC	Senior Conservation Officer

SC Conservation comments to agents' comments and revised plans:

I note that the agent suggests that none of the consultees have visited the site but I would state that I have been to this site on more than one occasion previously and considered a site visit to be a luxury rather than a necessity for this proposal.

This is a grade II* listed building and as such any development should provide enhancement or at minimum be neutral within the overall site context, thus resulting in no harm to the significance of the heritage asset. The property is large, and has a range of existing outbuildings, which are part of the application. The remaining existing outbuildings are of historic value despite having been adapted to provide garaging, with the entrance to the garaging facing south and accessed from a drive that runs along the boundary of the site.

It is noted that historically this range of outbuildings were double in length and appeared to exist on 1999 mapping, but appear to have been removed after that date. As noted above the property is large and Officers question the need for further accommodation for the house and that staff accommodation or office could be provided within existing structures or reinstatement of a small section of the lost buildings to provide for such a use, in addition to the existing garaging. At this point it appears that no consideration to this has been given.

The alterations to the drawings for the proposed garage and accommodation building has been reviewed and whilst it is noted as having been reduced Officers still have concerns regarding its scale and location within the setting of the Grade II* listed building the less than substantial harm it will cause to the significance of the dwelling by this overbearing proposal within its setting. There are no public benefits of the scheme to outweigh the harm caused.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7 & 8	24/01938/FUL & 24/01939/FUL	Case Officer

The recommendation for refusal still stands but that the following words be removed from the reason for refusal number 1, given that the revised plans remove the previously proposed dormers - '(including the dormer windows)'