

**Planning Applications Committee: 9 January 2020  
Updates to reports**

---

**Application: 19/01389/F & 19/01390/L**

**Address: 191 King Street**

**Item no: 4(a)**

**Pages: 13-66**

**Additional consultation response – Design & Conservation**

The revised scheme is more respectful of the historic arch positioned to the centre of the site and better reveals its significance. Conceivably, the revised scheme also increases the long-term security of the non-designated heritage asset, by increasing its visibility, allowing for its enclosure and allowing for a programme of conservation. Although the revised scheme results in the historic arch being susceptible to weathering, this is a manageable issue and a long-term programme of conservation is securable through condition. This must include the removal of the paintwork from both elevations in an agreed manner.

To conclude; the benefits associated with the increased visibility of this non-designated heritage asset and its conservation outweighs the potential for additional harm thus, in principle I am supportive of this revision, but suggest that we need to secure the following information/clarification either through condition or prior to determination, at your discretion:

Detail of the following, in order to be satisfied of the appearance of the development:

- Soft capping (what is planned, purely grass?)
- Steel armature
- Spec of brick,
- Spec of lime mortar
- Granite sets (conditioned as part of landscaping?)
- Detailed plans, sections and elevations of the arch and how it relates to its immediate setting, including the proposed steps, retaining wall, bench and any other feature.

Clarification on the following to secure the long-term preservation of the non-designated heritage asset:

- Ongoing annual assessment of the arch (alluded to in Rossi Long Consulting. Historic arch retention report, December 2019. Section 2.9) monitored/managed by whom? What guarantee that any findings are acted upon?; I suggest that a condition be applied requiring a detailed conservation management plan for the arch, which clearly outlines responsibility for the maintenance of the arch as well as detailing the level and regularity of its assessment.
- In principle, the method of protection during contiguous piling works consisting of enclosing the arch within a plywood frame, with the addition of

compressible material is appropriate. However, this method does not appear to take into account the change in depth of the wall when viewed from the west. I suggest that notwithstanding the information supplied, a far more detailed method of the protection of the arch is required, but based upon that already submitted. I also suggest that the timber encasement of the wall/s be retained for the duration of the works and checked at regular intervals.

- The extent of the retention of the width of the existing walls, adjacent to the arch, depends upon the scheme proposed around it. This has been previously determined. However, it is not clear why the height of the walls should be reduced. I suggest that the height of the walls adjacent to the arch should be as existing.

Additionally I suggest the following be requested/applied:

- Heritage interpretation – some kind of information relating to the significance of the arch and why it is retained in situ...
- Demolition of outbuildings containing historic arch to be by hand, by hand powered tools only and will allow for the retention of all flint and brick salvaged, to be stored on site for re-use on site, either during the reconstruction/consolidation of the arch and adjacent walls, or for other landscaping/heritage interpretation features.

#### **Officer response:**

The consultation response is noted. An additional condition is recommended to accompany 19/01389/F:

- Outbuildings to be demolished by hand

#### **Additional consultation response – Citywide Services**

The new location of the bin store is closer to the road so this is fine. The bin store appears to be a little tight but still contains 14 bins (7 of each) which is fine. I don't believe this to be much of an issue as all of the bins can be accessed by the residents. There is never a guarantee that residents will evenly distribute their waste over the 14 bins anyway so the fact the bins store is a little tight probably won't have much of an adverse effect.

---

**Application: 19/01597/F**  
**Address: 173 College Road**  
**Item no: 4(d)**  
**Pages: 95-102**

**Additional letter of representation – GP’s at request of owner of 71 College Road<sup>1</sup>**

A letter of representation has been received from the doctor of the owner of the adjoining property to the south, no. 71 College Road (the objector). She has requested that the comments made by the GP on are shared with members.

The GP states the objector has been a patient of his for a number of years and that she has explained that she fears the proposed extension will cut down the amount of natural light that comes into the room at the back of her house and also reduce her view.

The GP confirms that the objector has a number of medical problems which have a variable impact on her physically and also result in her spending lengthy periods of time at home. The back room closest to the proposed extension is used by her for study, work and relaxation. The GP confirms that he believes there is some validity in the objector’s concerns that the proposed extension would impact detrimentally on her psychological wellbeing, and that this should be taken into consideration when making a decision.

**Response**

The effect of a development on neighbouring properties is typically considered generically and without regard to the particular personal circumstances of neighbouring occupants. The test is normally the level of harm on an occupier of a neighbouring property rather than the occupier.

Whilst personal circumstances can be a material consideration in the determination of a planning application, care needs to be taken in how much weight to give to such matters. Occupiers will regularly change throughout a buildings life and therefore officers would give the above considerations relatively limited weight.

In this case, it is considered that future occupiers of 71 College Road would continue to benefit from a high level of amenity after the extension and that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact. Indeed it is officer’s view that the impact would be minimal particularly given that number 71 is located to the south of 73. Therefore giving some limited weight to the personal circumstances detailed above it remains officer’s recommendation to approve the application.

---

<sup>1</sup> Names have been redacted.