



**Late Observations Sheet**  
**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**  
**14 August 2014 at 7.00 pm**

**Late Observations**

This page is intentionally left blank

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**14 August 2014**

**LATE OBSERVATION SHEET**

**4.2 SE/14/00849/HOUSE & SE/14/00850/LBCALT Threeways, The Street, Ash TN15 7HA**

An email has been received from Cllr Cameron Clark raising a number of issues regarding the accuracy of the report.

Firstly, the following is stated in connection with comments received by the Georgian Group:

*"The principal area of concern appears to stem from the comments of the Georgian Group, set out in paragraph 23 of the report, whose views relating to the scale and massing of the proposed side extension have informed the subsequent appraisal and recommendation. The Group's views appear to be based on a fundamental misunderstanding of the scale of the extension because they state, "the proposed extension will nearly double the footprint of the listed building". This is clearly not the case as a two-storey extension of nearly twice the footprint could not fall below the 50% limit for extensions to properties in the Green Belt and it is set out later in the report (paragraph 76) that this criterion **has** been met".*

For clarity, the Georgian Group considers that the extension is too great in terms of scale and massing. The Georgian Group states that it objects for these reasons. The Georgian Group then states that *"the proposed extension will nearly double the 'footprint' of the Listed Building, altering the vertical emphasis of the building to a horizontal one"*.

In response to the above, the Georgian Group comments on the increase in 'footprint' which is different to the increase in 'gross floor area'. Gross floor area forms the subject of discussion in which it is determined whether or not the proposal is regarded as inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This discussion is set out at paragraphs 60 - 78 of the officer's report.

With regards to the matter of the increase in the footprint, the footprint of the original building (excluding the breakfast room extension) is 77.28m<sup>2</sup> the footprint of the proposed extension is 41m<sup>2</sup> which is a 53.05% increase in the footprint. Including the breakfast room the existing footprint of the building is approximately 93.63m<sup>2</sup> the extension would represent a 43.79% increase in the existing footprint of the Listed Building. In each case it is acknowledged that the footprint is less than double the footprint of the original building and the building in its extended form.

However, it should be noted that it does not necessarily follow that the scale, mass and bulk of a proposal is acceptable in terms of its impact on a Listed Building just because it is regarded as appropriate development in the Green Belt. Neither is it considered that the proposal is acceptable just because the extension is less than double the footprint of the original and existing building. The reasons why the scale, mass and bulk of the proposed extension to this particular Listed Building are considered to be harmful is discussed at length in the officers report.

## Agenda Item

It is stated by Cllr Clark that *“the Georgian Group's comments refer to "a number of internal doors being relocated/removed" and that a study of the plans shows that no changes are proposed to existing doors in the property, only the creation of openings into the proposed extension”*. To clarify, with regards to alterations to existing openings, the plans indicate alterations to the cupboard doors at first floor and alterations in the roof space which indicate the provision of a new doorway.

Paragraph 88 of the officers report states that the property does not benefit from off street parking. It should be noted that this did not effect the officer recommendation. However, on behalf of the applicant, Cllr Clark clarifies that the property does benefit from off-street parking provision. A garage and parking area is located in the northern part of the curtilage, with access by a drive, as shown on the site plan, along the northern flank of 5 Wallace Terrace. This was not readily apparent at the time of the Officers site visit. However, since receiving confirmation of this the officer has been back to the site and can concur that paragraph 88 of the officers report is incorrect and that there is adequate off street parking provision.

Finally, Cllr Clark states that *“accepting that the advice of the previous Conservation Officer is not binding, the applicant believes paragraph 19 of the report does not do justice to the extensive discussions that took place, including a two-hour meeting and consideration by the Conservation Officer of the original plans and two subsequent revisions which were specifically intended to take account of her recommendations and ensure the extension appeared, through its set back and window detailing, as a subservient addition to the main dwelling”*. It is stated that this relates particularly to the views expressed in paragraph 53 of the officers report about the relationship of the windows in the proposed extension to those in the existing house. Cllr Clark considers that Members need to be made aware that the size of the windows is a direct consequence of the advice from the former Conservation Officer in order to emphasise the subservience of the extension.

### For clarification:

It is confirmed that in assessing the proposal at the pre-application stage, that the conservation officer did visit the site and view the property internally as well as externally before making her comments.

Whilst the current conservation officer did not go in the property itself, her main objection was to the size and form of the proposed extension and that it would overwhelm the modest proportions of the listed property. It was also considered to unbalance and diminish the presence of the principle elevation and that the new works would obscure the simple form of the historic floor plan. As there was a fundamental objection in principle on these grounds and as all these elements could be seen from the public viewpoint and through looking at the plans, it was considered that there was not a need to go into the building.

### Recommendation

That permission be refused, as per the main papers.