

Case Officer: Catherine Harker

Recommendation: Approve

Applicant: Dave & Amy Brace

Proposal: Discharge of Conditions 3 (doors, windows and louvres), 4 (stone sample panel) and 5 (roof material sample) of 20/00672/F

Expiry Date: 4 August 2021

1. APPLICATION SITE AND DESCRIPTION OF APPROVED DEVELOPMENT

The extension has been started, and at the time of visit, the walls were largely complete.

2. RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

CDC Conservation:

Joinery details:

Raised various questions regarding the windows. There are not enough details to discharge the joinery details condition, and the details of the door proposed are not correct – Objection

Stone panel:

The photos of the existing wall are of smeared pointing that has substantially reduced the proportion of visible stone to mortar but the original thin joint behind can be seen where the later pointing is missing.

This shows that the wall needs to be built with much finer joints on bed and perpend. Due to the nature of the stone the width of the mortar joint will vary – objection

Roof samples :

It would be helpful to see the proposed roof tiles against the existing, is there a fallen fragment that would allow a direct comparison wet and dry?

3. APPRAISAL

Having visited the site to view the samples in situ against the existing building, it became clear that the applicants had decided to start work without waiting for their conditions to be discharged.

The Conservation Officer's comments regarding the stonework are noted, however having viewed the walls, the mortar is not so thick as to make the extension appear incongruous or a bad match for the existing building, and the stone itself appeared to be a good match. It is considered therefore that the stonework may be discharged.

The roof tiles are an extremely good match for the existing tiles, being re-claimed tiles of a similar age. Existing and proposed are concrete tiles as described in the approved application, and the tiles will be a good match for existing

The Conservation officer objected to the joinery details provided, and the Agent has therefore sent a response to her questions and objections.

The Conservation Officer raised concerns that the details for the high window in the existing gable end above the extension were not the same size as the approved drawing. The agent has explained that the original approved drawing showed a approximate size as it wasn't until they had scaffolding up that they knew what size it is. It is still intended to fit the window into the existing window surround. Joinery details for the window have now been submitted with the agent's comments. This window is now acceptable.

The agent has confirmed that the mid rail of the door would be flush as requested by the Conservation Officer.

The joinery details are now considered acceptable.

4. RECOMMENDATION

That Planning Condition(s) 3,4 and 5 of 20/0673/LB be discharged based upon the following

Condition 3

In accordance with the joinery details submitted with the application, and the details submitted by the agent in response to the Conservation officer's comments, received 28/09/21

Condition 4

In accordance with the walls as built and inspected on site 11/08/21

Condition 5

In accordance with the tile samples inspected 11/08/21

Case Officer: Catherine Harker

DATE: 29 September 2021

Checked By: Paul Ihringer

DATE: 1/10/21
