

Consultation Response Pro forma

1	Application Number	DC/19/00596 Walnut Tree Cottage, Sherbourne Street, Edwardstone	
2	Date of Response	06/03/2019	
3	Responding Officer	Name:	Thomas Pinner
		Job Title:	Heritage and Design Officer
		Responding on behalf of...	Heritage Team
4	Summary and Recommendation (please delete those N/A) Note: This section must be completed before the response is sent. The recommendation should be based on the information submitted with the application.	<p>1. The Heritage Team considers that the proposal would cause</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No harm to a designated heritage asset because the proposed extension and other works would not cause any further harm to the significance of the listed building, subject to conditions. 	
5	Discussion Please outline the reasons/rationale behind how you have formed the recommendation. Please refer to any guidance, policy or material considerations that have informed your recommendation.	<p>The application concerns the erection of a single-storey extension to Walnut Tree Cottage, a Grade II Listed C17-C18 timber-framed dwelling (listed as Juglans). The heritage concern relates to the impact of the development on the significance of Walnut Tree Cottage and the setting of Sherbourne House (Grade II) to the south.</p> <p>An earlier application, DC/18/03793, proposed the erection of a single storey flat roof extension to an existing C20 rear extension. The existing extension, granted Planning Permission in 1971, consists of a mono-pitched range running parallel, but offset, to the historic core of the dwelling, with a second mono-pitched wing extending perpendicular of the back of the first. The Heritage Team considered that this extension is of a complicated and incongruous appearance and not in-keeping with the simple articulation and appearance of the historic core. Additionally, its non-traditional articulation and roof forms sit awkwardly with its more traditional fenestration arrangement. Therefore, it is considered to detract from the significance of the listed building. The Heritage Team considered that the addition of a flat-roofed element to it would have increased its complicated nature and lead to cumulative harm to the listed building.</p>	

Please note that this form can be submitted electronically on the Councils website. Comments submitted on the website will not be acknowledged but you can check whether they have been received by reviewing comments on the website under the application reference number. Please note that the completed form will be posted on the Councils website and available to view by the public.

		<p>The revised application proposes an extension of a similar footprint to the previous, but now proposes redesigning the mono-pitched roof form on the perpendicular wing, so that it incorporates the extension under a single, shallower mono-pitch, rather than introducing a new (flat) roof form. Consequently, the Heritage Team considers that the extension would not increase the complicated nature of the existing extension and therefore would not be any more harmful than the existing. Additionally, the increase in footprint of the extension is relatively minimal. The extension is therefore considered acceptable, subject to detail (see conditions).</p> <p>The proposed glazing on the extension would be of a more overtly contemporary form than the existing it would replace. This is considered to result in a slight improvement to the form of existing extension and thus make a minor enhancement to the significance of the listed building. It would reduce the disjointed relationship between the modern and traditional elements of the extension, subject to detail (see conditions).</p> <p>The Heritage Team considers that cladding the existing and proposed extensions with feather-edged weatherboarding is acceptable, as this would not harm the significance of the listed building.</p> <p>The Heritage Team considers that replacing the existing door/screen on the front (east) elevation of the 1970s extension is acceptable, as it is not of historic interest. Its proposed replacement is acceptable in principle, subject to detail (see conditions).</p> <p>The replacement of the large rear window on the rear elevation of the main building is acceptable in principle, as it is not of historic interest and the proposed window would not cause any additional harm in this case, subject to detail (see conditions).</p> <p>In conclusion, the application meets the requirements of s.16 of the P(LBCA)A 1990 and the policies in the NPPF and the Local Plan. It is for these reasons that the Heritage Team does not object to this proposal, subject to conditions.</p>
6	Amendments, Clarification or Additional Information Required (if holding objection)	

Please note that this form can be submitted electronically on the Councils website. Comments submitted on the website will not be acknowledged but you can check whether they have been received by reviewing comments on the website under the application reference number. Please note that the completed form will be posted on the Councils website and available to view by the public.

	If concerns are raised, can they be overcome with changes? Please ensure any requests are proportionate	
7	Recommended conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manufacturer's details of all new roof facing materials. - Detailed elevation and section drawings of all new doors and windows, at 1:10 or 1:2 as appropriate. - Detailed section drawing through the eaves and verge of the altered mono-pitch at 1:10. - Any new rainwater goods to match existing.

Please note that this form can be submitted electronically on the Councils website. Comments submitted on the website will not be acknowledged but you can check whether they have been received by reviewing comments on the website under the application reference number. Please note that the completed form will be posted on the Councils website and available to view by the public.