

Emily Stainer

From: Mark Peacock
Sent: 05 January 2017 11:45
To: Planning
Subject: FW: 16/0347/LB Erection of single storey rear extension and internal alterations at The Oshwal Centre, Coopers Green Road, Northaw

Please record comments from the Council's Conservation Officer in respect of the amended proposal.

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: 05 January 2017 11:40
To: Mark Peacock
Subject: RE: 16/0347/LB Erection of single storey rear extension and internal alterations at The Oshwal Centre, Coopers Green Road, Northaw

Mark,

My previous comments were as below:

The concerns were about the overall size including the width which would mask the only remaining part of the Victorian rear elevation in views from the rear.

The new proposals do not address this and the introduction of a pitched roof doesn't really work because the plan form is too deep for it to be naturally applied and it would hide yet more of the rear elevation at high level. I also have to say that the design shows no appreciation of the original architecture, especially in the imposition of gable-ended roofs rather than the hipped roofs of the existing. The introduction of the glazed area between the new and the old is not objected to but it has no purpose in addressing the concerns.

I remain of the view that considerable extensions have already been permitted and that it would be quite possible to contain more covers within, if the applicants would compromise a little by introducing partial split levels.

Andrew

Previous comments

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.

.

--