

Emily Stainer

From: Mark Peacock
Sent: 24 November 2016 11:41
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Northaw, The Oshwal Centre, Coopers Green Road, 16/0347/LB

Please record comments from the Conservation Officer

Kind regards

Mark Peacock BA (Hons) MSc
Senior Development Management Officer
Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council

Council Offices | The Campus | Welwyn Garden City | Hertfordshire | AL8 6AE
Tel: 01707 35700 | Direct: 01707 357249 | email: m.peacock@welhat.gov.uk | website: www.welhat.gov.uk

From: Andrew Robley
Sent: 04 November 2016 13:02
To: Mark Peacock
Subject: FW: Northaw, The Oshwal Centre, Coopers Green Road, 16/0347/LB

Mark,

When I visited last week, the applicants advised me that the option of putting the kitchen in the basement wasn't acceptable to them because the kitchen staff were volunteers and part of the community and that this would divorce them from interaction with the diners.

I mooted the possibility of adding the facilities to the existing new Oshwal Centre but this was rejected due to the fact that this was used for private lettings, although I can't see that that this would necessarily be problematical if it was properly separated and might indeed give useful flexibility in some circumstances.

My concerns about extending the approved flat roofed extension further and covering up the whole of the rear elevation of this phase of the building remain the same.

An alternative more acceptable compromise might be to treat the extension as split level, part being in a semi-basement and therefore giving a similar number of covers. If handled well interaction between diners and volunteer kitchen staff could be acceptable.

My previous comments are below.

Andrew

From: Andrew Robley
Sent: 26 May 2016 16:58
To: Mark Peacock <m.peacock@welhat.gov.uk>
Cc: Planning <planning@welhat.gov.uk>
Subject: Northaw, The Oshwal Centre, Coopers Green Road, 16/0347/LB

The site is the former ;large Country House known as Hook House, Regency Period, begun in 1839 of white painted stucco and generally with low-pitched slate roofs. However, the North elevation was partly extended in the late C20th with a single storey flat roofed part and a two storey pitched roof element, both of which mask part of the west wing. The extension however, is flush with the east wing. Although this is not the main entrance elevation, it is clear, from the architectural quality of the windows and other features, that the house was designed to be seen from all sides, in an open parkland setting.

However, permission was given in 2013 to remove part of this later extension and replace it with a significantly larger one.(12/2022/LB), which would be completely flat-roofed. And would project well forward of the line of the

east wing.. However, it would not be full width and part of the original elevation of the west wing would still be visible at full height.

The new proposal would extend further by approximately 2.7metres making an overall extension of approximately 8.5 metres. To put this into context, this would approximately double the depth of the original west wing. The previously approved extension was allowed in this location because there had already been a modern extension at this point. However, the point was made at the time that the rear of the west wing could still be seen and therefore the “Victorian” or listed form of the building could still be appreciated.

The problem with the new proposal is that it would extend completely across the west wing and the “as listed” form of the building would become less distinguishable. Furthermore the area of flat roof , which is essentially out of character with the listed building, would be increased.

I appreciate the community worth of the whole site and that this should be balanced against any detriment to the character of the building (NPPF 134) but reasonable latitude has already been given by the previous approval and this would now be a step too far.

It would seem that the need is for more dining accommodation and that part of the available space is taken up by the kitchens. I would therefore advise that there could be an option whereby the previous approval is built out but that the new extension should have a basement which could accommodate a kitchen.

Recommendation: As it stands, the proposal would extend too far and would cover up the remainder of the ground floor of the west wing. It would therefore harm the character and appearance of the listed building and its setting, would not now be sufficiently balanced by the community benefit and would not conform to the NPPF 2012 paras 7, 8, 9 , 131, 132, 134 and the Local Plan D1, D2, R25.

Further Advice: A large extension was previously approved and it is felt that the perceived form should not extend further than this. It is recommended that the applicant looks at the possibility of housing the kitchens in a basement under the approved extension which would free up more dining space.

Andrew