

Bassetlaw District Council  
Planning Department  
Queen's Buildings  
Potter Street  
Worksop  
S80 2AH

Thorn Lea Cottage  
Church Lane  
Askham  
Newark  
NG22 0RU

Attn: Mr John McKeown

15<sup>th</sup> September 2022

### OBJECTION

**Application Ref: 22/01109/FUL, High Ridge, Top Street, Askham, NG22 0RP**

Dear Mr McKeown,

Further to my comments via the planning portal I confirm my objection to the above proposal.

I attended the Parish Meeting last night where the architect presented the proposal in detail and village residents made statements about the effects on their amenity. I can now confirm the following specific material planning considerations:

I refer to the Bassetlaw Core Strategy & Development Management Policies DPD.

**DM4 B i:** The development does not respect its wider surroundings in relation to historic development patterns or building/plot sizes and forms; density; and landscape character.

The proposal is a three storey house where a bungalow now stands. The footprint extends beyond the existing dwelling making the building plan much larger and dramatically increasing the height.

The proposed development is out of character with the surroundings both in terms of the village and the wider area. The relationship of the architecture to the surroundings is one of contrast rather than harmony.

**DM4 B ii:** The proposal does not respect its context in terms of height, scale, mass, materials and detailing.

The proposed build is out of scale with the neighbouring properties. The design of three storeys requires a ridge height that has been aligned with that of the house at the top of the hill. The natural fall in the land of Top Street is currently followed by the roof lines. This natural and pleasing line can clearly be seen from our bedroom window. The

higher ridge line of the proposal does not take into account the local topography. In fact there is no proper topographical analysis. Viewed from our direction there will be a jarring effect in the ridge lines, this will be much greater when viewed from the front. Page 9 of the Parish Presentation 13.09.22 clearly shows how the new house dominates, and is out of scale with Byecroft House, itself quite a large building. The buildings further down are smaller and therefore even more overpowered.

The materials proposed are of high quality, intended to reflect the local architecture and there are details which can be seen in local buildings. The scale of the development and the proportions of glass and brick do not relate to local character. This amounts to a pastiche. A large modern building has had some design elements from local architecture included without altering the fact that it is a massive construction using large areas of glass.

**DM4 B v:** The development has a detrimental effect on the residential amenity of nearby residents.

Eight dwellings are directly affected by loss of privacy, restriction of light or are overlooked. This materially affects the wellbeing of twenty eight residents.

**DM8 B:** There will be a presumption against development, alteration, advertising or demolition that will be detrimental to the significance of a heritage asset.

Proposed development affecting heritage assets, including alterations and extensions that are of an inappropriate scale, design or material, or which lead to the loss of important spaces, including infilling, will not be supported.

The Coach House is a non-designated heritage asset reference 2512 on the Bassetlaw spreadsheet of 2019. It is noted for historic and architectural interest and aesthetic appeal. The proposal assumes complete demolition of the Coach House and I can see no mention of it in the NJ-A presentation of 13.09.22. It seems not to have been taken into consideration at any level, other than as an inconvenience. According to the wording of DM 8 B this development cannot be supported.

Further, the street scene will be radically altered should the Coach House be demolished. This is not covered in the NJ-A presentation. In fact it is completely avoided; there are no views of the street scene showing the proposed development from different points in the street. If the development proceeds further much more attention should be given to the relationship with the Coach House and the street scene otherwise the requirements of DM8 B will not be met.

**Light Pollution** Considering Askham is quite rural we do not have dark sky, there is extensive light pollution. This can be minimised by careful lighting design and switching. No attention seems to have been given to light spilling from inside or outside

the building at night. Additionally the large glazed areas are likely to create significant glare from reflected sunlight in the day.

**Local Engagement** This proposal has obviously been in development for a considerable time but no effort to engage local people has been made until the last two weeks. My wife and I regularly walk in Top Street but we did not see the public notice until the late August Bank Holiday. I believe the notice was posted on the 25<sup>th</sup> August with today being the final day for public comments. This is a very short time to understand the implications of a major development. The lack of engagement indicates to me a lack of interest in developing the site in a way that suits the character of the surroundings and to meet the requirements of the BCS&DMP DPD.

**Summary** The development should not proceed in its proposed form as it is not in character with the environment and creates loss of amenity for the reasons stated above. I would support a more sympathetic development of smaller scale that incorporates the heritage asset. This could be modern or traditional style or use elements of both.

Yours sincerely,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

Martyn Hunter-Wyatt