

From: Frnc Sinc
Sent: 13 August 2019 09:58
To: Mark Hill; Ailsa Teasdale
Subject: 10 SthEnd Osmotherley Note ref Drwgs C and C1-NYM2017/0717/FL - NYM2017/0722/LB

Attn: Mark Hill

Copy: Ailsa Teasdale

Mark,

Thank you for your email response of the 29July19. Further to your comments I sought to get in touch to clarify some of the issues raised but was unfortunately unable to speak with you. As I was shortly going on leave and wished to ensure I had addressed the concerns raised to meet the 5 Sept Committee date, your Conservation Officer, Suzanne Lilly agreed to try to assist in your absence. I have sent through a revised drawing.

In respect of the revisions requested:

1. I have removed four of the 5 new lighting and ventilation slots but in discussion with Suzanne Lilley it was accepted that the fifth new slot which assisted in daylight illumination and vented the bathroom could be allowed as it was contained within the gable and did not impact adversely on the balance of the existing lighting and ventilation slots. In addition a ventilation extract through the roof was proposed as acceptable subject to conditioning.
2. I have removed the in out banding as shown highlighted on the drawings, these do exist to some extent in the existing construction but are not dressed stone.
3. I have lowered the height of the roof glazing to the glazed conservatory.
4. I was prepared to amend the windows and doors to the pigsty such as to rationalise but asked for clarity as to the meaning of rationalise. In discussion, I advised your conservation officer that the proposed reflected the existing openings and the removal of the stone banding shown would improve the door position away from the return but as close to the glazed extension would possibly allow only one door opening to serve for both. Your Conservation Officer felt that given the use of the existing openings as shown that this could probably be left as shown on the drawing subject to your agreement.
5. I have adopted your proposal of a heavily recessed dark glazed fan light to read as a void, to avoid putting glazing in the external doors to the front of the elevation whilst still allowing some daylight into the space beyond.
6. I have previously sent details of heritage slimline double glazing proposed, together with internal insulation proposed to external elements as discussed to your conservation officer.
7. I spoke with Ailsa Teasdale in updating on the above and have now sent two updated drawings, as discussed with her, incorporating the above revisions through to yourself with a copy to Ailsa, yesterday at the end of the day.

The two drawing numbered C and C1 are identical except in respect of the kitchen to the existing dwelling. I raised this issue with both Suzanne Lilly and Ailsa and the latter advised sending in the two drawings so that whatever was decided that the application could proceed to the 5 Sept committee with a proposal for approval.

I know that you advised that the kitchen extension I requested, which went across the entire south elevation of the original dwelling, should be forgotten as it was not going to get approval as it was felt to destroy the interpretation of the original dwelling.

However as previously explained, the constricted space, especially after rebuilding the external walls to repair to address the extensive frost damage and to provide an inner skin, as the wall is only a single skin matters considerably in the use of the space. I have put forward an alternative extension that does not impact on the southern elevation, allowing the legibility of the original dwelling to be retained as though no extension had been made. The elevation from the north cannot be seen and nor can it be seen from the East as it is behind the building line of the neighbours own outbuildings and he is happy with the proposal. The elevation for the west is predominantly blocked by the pigsty and cannot be seen except from a distance at the extreme end of the adjacent garden and does not block any view or aspect. The impact on the modelling and scale of the buildings is barely noticeable and the roof height remains the same due to the pitch adopted acceptable for the roof tiles. The only aspect affected is that, looking at it from the sky, which is not readily available to the public. Your Conservation officer would prefer no extensions but advised she would raise with you trying to present both sides. Ailsa advised that two drawings should be sent in, one with and one without the extension to allow the scheme to progress whatever decision is made.

I would ask that you give further consideration to allowing an extension to the kitchen as indicated as it allows the view of the house you wish to protect and has minimal effect on the visual modelling and scale of the overall building form and has a considerable impact on the usability of the space.

Please let me know your decision and that the information submitted, whatever your decision, is now sufficient to allow the scheme to go forward and so I can arrange for the planning consultant to submit the appropriate drawing as advised either C or C1 via the planning portal together with the details for glazing and insulation already sent through for consideration.

I would be grateful if my email address is not put in the public domain online.

K. Livingston

NYMNPA

13/08/2019