

## Christopher Harrison

---

**From:** david shankland  
**Sent:** 14 February 2024 14:11  
**To:** Christopher Harrison  
**Cc:** Samuel Woodford  
**Subject:** Application reference : 4/23/2327/0f1  
**Attachments:** PHASE 2 HERITAGE STATEMENT HENSINGHAM DS1.pdf; Hensingham Phases 1 & 2 Landscape Plan Rev A 12 02 24.pdf; sw response phase 2 hensingham.pdf

CAUTION: External email, think before you click!

Please report any suspicious email to our IT

Helpdesk<[https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fcopelandeu.freshservice.com%2Fcatalog%2Frequest\\_items&data=05%7C02%7CChristopher.Harrison%40copeland.gov.uk%7Cd25c4f6f1d41451b7d9808dc2d66cdd5%7Cb6d1253e02e144bb8e79fe4ee8606cf0%7C1%7C0%7C638435167403139627%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=qeuaKVR RjHKljEuwlvEIQEdmleDjF5pAJXCuLNCwj0o%3D&reserved=0](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fcopelandeu.freshservice.com%2Fcatalog%2Frequest_items&data=05%7C02%7CChristopher.Harrison%40copeland.gov.uk%7Cd25c4f6f1d41451b7d9808dc2d66cdd5%7Cb6d1253e02e144bb8e79fe4ee8606cf0%7C1%7C0%7C638435167403139627%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=qeuaKVR RjHKljEuwlvEIQEdmleDjF5pAJXCuLNCwj0o%3D&reserved=0)>

Hi Chris

Further to the response from Samuel Woodford.

I respond to his points as detailed below. Referenced 1 - 10 I enclose the landscaping plan. I enclose copy of heritage statement.

1 - The proposed design is set out to be sympathetic to the existing house, with the gable of plot 1 Providing the same orientation of the approved phase 1 gable of house 1.

The gable of house 1 (PHASE 1) is rendered, and therefore, this finish is portrayed on the table of plot 1 (phase 2).

This gable, if required can be facing brick finish as an alternative.

2 - I don't feel any change in orientation would greatly benefit any use of PV, indeed I will be trying to eliminate any use of PV in the construction of the dwellings. I add that the roof orientation is the same as the existing buildings.

3 - Chimneys (or mock chimneys) can be added, I have no resistance to that if required. I don't understand the point in reference to the gaps between properties. The gaps are quite generous in order to give the dwellings a sense of space, separated by timber fencing.

4 - I find these comments quite vague.

What further refinement is required, ? I will take any comments on board. I think the design has achieved a level of refinement and is sympathetic to the existing buildings and the location.

If it is felt that the dormers are "clumsy" then I accept your recommendations.

I will provide quoins to the rear of the properties if it is felt that this will enhance the properties.

5 - The change in facing materials is in order to prevent the four dwellings being regimental in appearance. It also mimics to a certain extent the varying materials of the existing dwellings.

6 - I accept this point

The roofing material will be slate, the walls facing brick, and the render (to be agreed colour)

7 - Please refer to landscaping plan (Westwood) Confused as why it is suggested that the elevation drawings lack any context.

I think the elevations show quite clearly the proposed design. (Please clarify ) The parking areas will be setts, The separation will be with timber fences.

Landscaping as plan (Westwood)

8 - Please see enclosed Heritage Statement (Copy of original submitted on the 20th September 2023

9 - Please refer to landscape plan (Westwood)

10 - windows have been noted as UPVC. The existing building has UPVC windows and doors.

Regards

David

SAMUAL WOODFORD  
COURT FELL RESTORATION  
REF: 4125/2327/OFF

- I would expect the development of 4 no. detached town houses in the proposed location to harm the setting of Hensingham House by reducing the ability of its frontage to be appreciated within the setting of its garden.
- However, I would also give this harm limited weight as the building is not listed and the location within the conservation area is on private land and therefore not generally appreciate to the public. Once the proposal has been implemented (and there are additional proposals for the conversion of the main house to multiple flats and addition of further dwellings on the land to the west), more people will be able to access this area.
- Additionally, the distance between Hensingham House and the new houses is quite large, preserving the space between them but also making that space more likely to be characterised by parked cars.

Assessment:

- 1 • What impression of arrival is created by the south gable end of House 1? This will be the approach to the first development, and the view most residents and visitors will have of it. The south elevation of House 1 would appear to be rather nondescript, and certain a "side" rather than something that architecturally addresses the visitor.
- 2 • How does the orientation of the houses contribute to their ability to make use of PV generation, if desired. The roof pitches are orientated east and west. Would rotating these through 90° to provide a south-facing roof pitch be a good way of facilitating future PV capacity?
- 3 • The mid-19<sup>th</sup> century architectural style seems undermined by the lack of chimneys and the width of gaps between the houses, both of which are more late-20<sup>th</sup> century in character.
- 4 • Are the proportions and detailing of the proposed dwellings sufficiently refined? For example, the fascia detailing on the dormers looks clumsy and could benefit from further work. Should the quoins not also be present at the rear corners of the building?
- 5 • What is the reasoning behind one of the houses having a different facing material than the others?
- 6 • Examples of proposed materials should be supplied (These could be photos), such as the proposed roof slate, facing materials, surfacing materials etc.
- 7 • The site plan lacks enough detail on the context of the frontages, and the proposed front elevation drawings lack any context, meaning it is not possible to say what the overall effect will be from the front when built. For example, is the frontage surfaced with a continuous apron of setts for parking? What divides one house from another? Is it a fence, or a wall? Would hedges be a useful alternative, and if so, what sort?
- 8 • The heritage statement appears to be for a different project, and does not examine the contribution to the conservation area of setting of nearby heritage assets made by the current site, nor the likely impact caused by the development.
- 9 • Information should be provided on the trees to be removed, and account made for why the design is not responsive to existing site features. An as existing site plan would provide an opportunity to identify such features in red.
- 10 • Information should be provided on the proposed windows and doors. There is an expectation that these should be of timber construction in conservation areas.

URR 10