

From: Consult <consult@georgiangroup.org.uk>
Sent: 13 November 2020 12:04
To: Morris, Amber <Amber.Morris@herefordshire.gov.uk>
Subject: 2 Sheepwash Cottage, Knill, LD8 2PR

Dear Ms Amber Morris,

Thank you for informing the Georgian Group of the amended application affecting the above Grade II Listed estate cottage in the hamlet of Knill on the Powys/Herefordshire border. The Group wishes to offer the following attached advice.

Very best wishes,

Casework Assistant

Dear Ms Amber Morris,

Thank you for informing the Georgian Group of the amended application affecting the above Grade II Listed estate cottage in the hamlet of Knill on the Powys/Herefordshire border. The Group wishes to offer the following advice.

Sheepwash cottage is a charming early to mid-nineteenth century timber-framed building with herringbone brick nogging and a Welsh slate roof. The single-storey cottage has a T-plan with a central entrance at the north-east front and a gable-end stack to the south-east. Together with a neighbouring cottage of similar scale, the properties form a picturesque grouping on the south bank of the brook when approached by car or on foot from Knill.

The applicant proposes to extend the property with a single storey rear extension to an existing detached property. We support the applicant's decision to construct a detached structure in lieu of proposing extensive internal changes to the Grade II listed building. However, in keeping with our previous comments, the Group recommends that the application be revised to a reduced scale so that the proposed extension will not threaten the significance of the Grade II listed building and its setting.

In response to the initial application, the Group advised that the scale and massing of the proposed extension was entirely inappropriate for the scale of the cottage. Particularly, as the twentieth-century rear wing makes up nearly a third of the cottage's plan, the scale of the proposed extension would clearly dominate the surviving early to mid-nineteenth century fabric of the cottage. In this way, the proposed design did not respect the primacy of the original cottage and thus does not comply with Paragraph 200 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), which requires local planning authorities to look for opportunities for new development within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. The amended designs, both options one and two, are still of an unsuitable footprint when compared to that of the listed building, and risk disrupting the aesthetic value of the cottage and its picturesque contribution when viewed together with its neighbouring cottage. In accordance with paragraphs 128, 132 and 200 of the NPPF, the Group views that significance of a listed building can be harmed by development within its setting.

Additionally, in the initial application and the amended designs, the applicant supplied insufficient justification for the significance and potential harm caused by the proposed attachment of a link to the rear wing of the cottage. The critical importance of an applicant providing an adequate assessment of the significance of historic fabric which is to be altered is reinforced within NPPF 189. Paragraph 194 (NPPF 2019) states that 'Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification'.

The Georgian Group must advise that the supporting documentation provided remains insufficient and fails to explain the significance of the fabric which would be affected as a result of this application and to adequately justify the harm which may be caused to the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. Under section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, it is the statutory duty of local authorities, 'to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.' We therefore recommend that the application be withdrawn until such time as the appropriate supporting documentation and an extension with a considerably reduced footprint can be provided. If the applicant is unwilling to provide the required revisions and information listed building consent should be refused.

Yours Sincerely,

Casework Assistant

The information contained in this e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual(s) named. If you are not the named addressee(s) you should not copy, disseminate, or distribute this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free since information can arrive late or contain viruses, or be corrupted, destroyed, incomplete, intercepted, or lost. The sender therefore does not accept liability for any errors or omissions in the contents of this message, which arise because of e-mail transmission. If verification is required, please ask for a hard-copy version.