

Summary of Clarifications on Additional Information for Planning Application 24/0524 - Land North of Rock Cottage, Penhow

Thank you for confirming the latest status of the application. I have reviewed the most recent officer's report, prepared for the second committee meeting, which was presumably sent to the members before it was redacted offline. It appears there are still some misunderstandings regarding the scale and intensity of the structural work required. To address these, I have prepared additional drawings and information to provide further clarity.

I have also attached the body of this message as a PDF and kindly request that these documents be added to the application online and shared with the Planning Committee members as a late representation to clear up any confusion before further consideration.

Please find below a summary of the additional drawings and their purpose:

Drawing TG2203-21B - Proposed Plan and Elevations

This drawing illustrates the volume of the proposed extension in relation to the existing building, confirming that the increase remains within the parameters set by Policy H13. Specifically, the extension represents less than a 30% increase in volume, which aligns with the policy's criteria that such a modest extension does not equate to urbanisation in the countryside. The drawing also maps the internal floor area to the inside face of the proposed drylining, excluding the thick internal stone wall but including the stair feature, which is still usable space (for storage, placing a TV, etc.). This shows a noticeably larger area than the 25m² stated in the report, which did not account for the drylining and incorrectly suggested it would reduce the usable space further.

Drawing TG2203-32 - Structural Enhancement Strategy

This drawing highlights the two minor areas where localised underpinning is proposed, clarifying that underpinning is not required around the entirety of the barn, as previously suggested. It also confirms that the new wall drylining the existing stone walls is not a 'superstructure' requiring foundations to support the roof. The drylining is lightweight and is solely intended to improve thermal efficiency and prevent moisture ingress. This page also clarifies that the new roof will be supported by the existing stone walls, providing lateral restraint to the building. Additionally, it explains the use of Helibar as a non-intrusive propriety repair system to fix the structural cracks and connect the front and rear walls to the side walls, without the need for substantial reconstruction of the external walls. This page also clarifies what repointing is, and how it will be carried out as standard practice in restoration projects, not as a significant structural undertaking.

Drawing TG2203-33 - Structural Enhancement Strategy 2

This drawing depicts the proposed new low-level retaining wall to the rear of the property,

designed to alleviate pressure from the adjacent soil. The retaining wall will be finished in stone to match the building, screened by the existing structure, and will not interfere with the root protection zone. This measure will help preserve the building's structural integrity and longevity.

Drawing TG2203-34 - Integrity of Original Structure

This drawing outlines how the integrity of the original structure will be maintained and preserved. It reiterates that all existing openings will be utilised without any structural alterations, an original opening will be reopened, and features such as the inglenook fireplace and remains of the stone staircase will be restored, retained, and made into internal features. The only structural alteration is the creation of a small doorway in the existing left gable wall, which will not be visible externally and should not be considered as adversely affecting the building's integrity.

Drawing TG2203-25D - Landscape Strategy

This drawing addresses potential confusion regarding the proposed 'ornamental hedge.' Initially described as such when laurels were proposed, the hedge type was updated to a native beech hedge following earlier feedback from NRW. To avoid further misunderstanding, I have changed its description to 'Native screening hedge,' ensuring it is recognised as appropriate for the location. Additionally, more beech hedging has been added in front of the post-and-rail fence to address concerns that the fence alone may not adequately or appropriately define the residential boundary. This new approach ensures that the fence will serve as a clear boundary until the hedge has matured, and once matured, together they will prevent any encroachment of domestic paraphernalia. The drawing also includes all surfacing finishes, which have been confirmed by the landscape officer as appropriate for this sensitive location.

I believe these clarifications and updates address the concerns raised and provide a clearer picture of how the proposal aligns with policy requirements. Please do not hesitate to reach out if further explanation is needed, and I would be grateful if you could ensure this additional information is circulated to the Planning Committee members ahead of their next consideration.

Could you please confirm that this information will be passed on as requested?

Thank you.

Spence Gadsby

Tÿ Green Ltd.

07427657573

spence@tygreen.co.uk