**From:** Joyce Christie   
**Sent:** 09 March 2016 12:23  
**To:** Victoria Barrett  
**Cc:** 'jgaskin@hotmail.co.uk'  
**Subject:** RE: Yew Tree House

Hi Victoria

Please see my comments below in bold in response to the Agent's letter.  The removal of the stable doors is welcomed.

I have updated the drawing, but I should point out that I haven't made all the changes requested, the following is a description of your requests and the changes I have made: Garden gate/door – flush framed boarded door The style of the garden gate is deliberately based on an exact copy of the garden gate fitted within the existing stone wall. The opening we have formed is within a continued element of that stonewall and both the existing gate and the new proposed gate can be clearly seen from the same courtyard. We feel it would be completely incorrect to install something that looked alien and different from the existing gate. We note that the existing gate is a legend and braced design and has clearly been in place for some time. Please find attached a photograph showing this existing gate within the existing opening.

**I HAVE PREVIOUSLY NOTED THE EXISTING GATE AS BEING LEDGED AND BRACED BUT IT WAS NOT MADE FOR THE OPENING AS CAN BE SEEN FROM THE GAPS.  MY COMMENT WAS MADE IN RELATION TO ONGOING MAINTENANCE AND THE LIMITED LONGEVITY OF A LEDGED AND BRACED DOOR WHICH HAS ITS END GRAIN EXPOSED TO THE WEATHER. I DON'T HAVE AN OBJECTION TO REPLICATING THE LEDGED AND BRACED DOOR,  THE COMMENT WAS MADE FROM A MAINTENANCE VIEWPOINT.**

Single French door centred instead of two sets – without stable doors This is the one requested change that I am afraid I am not happy to undertake. I cannot see any particular justification in creating just a single opening. I would like to remind you that a double doorway opening was discussed with the Conservation officer on site and deemed to be an acceptable detail. The removal of the double opening and replacement with a single opening, would in my opinion cause, the front elevation to be dominated with stone. In my opinion this would not be a good detail and something I am very much against undertaking. I have however removed the stable doors from these openings

**THE COMMENT ABOUT A SINGLE OPENING WAS MADE AT PREAPP AND IS INCLUDED IN MY NOTES REGARDING THE DETAIL OF THE STEPS OVER THE LIGHTWELL.  IN THIS DISTRICT THERE IS OFTEN MORE SOLID TO VOID AND THERE ARE SOME FINE EXAMPLES OF HISTORIC ARCHITECTURE WHICH FORM THE BASIS OF THEORETICAL PROPORTIONING SYSTEMS. WITHIN THE PROPSED OPENINGS THE PROPORTION OF THE FRENCH DOORS IN THE KITCHEN EXTENSION SOUTH ELEVATION ARE TOO THIN WHICH EMPHASISES THE ODD PROPORTION OF THE EXTENSION WHICH HAS A DEEP SOLID BAND ABOVE LINTOL AND BELOW EAVES.  IT WOULD LOOK MORE ‘GROUNDED’ WITH A DIFFERENT WINDOW TREATMENT.**

**SUGGEST THE DOOR/WINDOW DESIGN AND DETAIL BE CONDITIONED - THE FRENCH DOOR DETAIL TO THE OPENINGS IN THE KITCHEN MAIN ELEVATION IS NOT AGREED.**

Window in garden wall – smaller opening. Not flush timber casement I have reduced the size of the window within the garden wall to a smaller size as requested. The window style was deliberately changed at the request of the Conservation officer so that it clearly didn't match the existing sash windows. I am not sure what the Conservation officer is looking for with this window, with the very limited time we been given to make these changes, it might be better that a detail of this window is requested as a condition of the approval?

**PLEASE CONDITION - THE NORTH DINING ROOM WINDOW IN THE HIGH GARDEN WALL IS ALIEN AND CHANGES THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE WALL – ENCOURAGE A SINGLE LIGHT WINDOW IN AN UNFUSSY PLAIN ‘PUNCHED’ OPENING - THE FRAME COULD BE HIDDEN BEHIND A REVEAL IN THE STONE OR HAVE A VERY SIMPLE PLAIN FRAME.**

Rooflight should be flush I have added a note to the main description on sheet 6000-01a which states that the rooflight should be flush fitting as requested.

**ROOFLIGHT CURRENTLY STRADDLES THE EXTERIOR WALL IT NEEDS TO BE MOVED FURTHER UP THE ROOFSLOPE BUT THIS IS JUST A DRAFTING ERROR.**

Lintels on kitchen extension to be ashlar stone not timber I have updated the note on the main description on sheet 6000-01a to state that the lintels are to be ashlar stone as requested.

**OK**

Slit window on east elevation to be reduced in height I have reduced the height of the slit window in the East elevation as requested.

**OK**

Summary: I have undertaken the changes as requested with the exception of the change of style to the door within the garden wall, as I believe that with my attached photograph is clear that it is best to copy the existing door style. I have removed the stable door openings, but I have left the double set of French doors as originally designed as I feel very strongly that this design change would be the wrong thing to do. May I please ask that you take the attached revised drawings as updates to our submitted scheme, and please determine the scheme based on these revised designs that are all noted with revision “a” following the drawing number for clarity

Best wishes

Joyce Christie

Design and Conservation Officer
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