1 November 2015

your Ref: **15/01202/FUL**

Application at: Trentholme Cottage 2A Trentholme Drive York YO24 1EN

For: Erection of 1no. three storey dwelling with storage building to rear
                                       following demolition of existing dwelling

Dear Mr Arnold

Planning sub- Committee 5th November

Further to our email of yesterday (31 October) we would be grateful if you would also forward this email to the Planning Committee members. Please also action the request in paragraph 3.

It was not apparent from your letter of 28 October that there would be a site visit. We are pleased to note the Members will have an opportunity of viewing the site for themselves.

1) There is no mention of whether the property is a non-designated heritage asset. We would like to nominate it as a non-designated heritage asset. We note that the Conservation Officer refers to the cottage as "charming". We understand it does not need to be in a conservation area to be on the non-designated heritage asset list.

At the outset of this application we would have expected to see a heritage statement, assessing the significance of heritage assets and the impact of the proposal on the non-designated heritage asset on the conservation area and setting of a listed building. It does not appear to have been done from the list of documents received.

We do not feel that assessment of the heritage assets has been undertaken in a proper manner to allow members to reach a fully informed decision.

We do not agree with the planning officer's view and feel that the loss of this building is unnecessary and would be harmful the conservation area. The property is known locally as the Gamekeeper's Cottage, for what used to be the estate belonging to Trentholme House further up the Mount. Trentholme Drive has been built in the orchard and grounds of Trentholme House.

2) The Planning Officer concludes that the development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. With respect, we strongly disagree. The area is that of Trentholme Drive. That is the property address. It is misconceived to compare it with the much larger properties either on The Mount itself or indeed those opposite which have The Mount address. In short the property should be compared to number two Trentholme Drive adjoining it, not the properties opposite. The

Planning Officer wrongly considers the context of local distinctiveness, as the property is related more closely to the semis on Trentholme Drive.

The development will not blend in with the remainder of the street which reflects the context. The scale of the development is out of kilter with the remainder of the street, as the proposed property is far too large, as is the shape and colour. The remainder of Trentholme Drive is more modest two-storey redbrick houses. The report is incorrect in its assessment and we would like the committee to consider the character and appearance of the proposed development in the context of our street.

We would not object to a sympathetic conversion of the cottage, perhaps extending the back or adding a dormer roof, if the applicant requires more space. To lose it entirely would detract from Trentholme Drive and harm the character and area of conservation. There have been a number of recent developments on Trentholme Drive, all of which have been sympathetic to the area and have not been opposed. We would ask you to compare and contrast the Ad House, which is an example of an innovative design, sympathetic to the local surroundings and scale and context of our street which fits in well in Trentholme Drive. The current proposal is not innovative; please do not be fooled by it being named a "contemporary Roman Villa". It is nothing of the sort. It is quite simply the wrong development in this location.

We are sorry that we will not be able to attend the planning meeting. However we urge the committee to reject the application not least because the heritage impacts have not been considered appropriately.

Yours faithfully

David and Shauna Finch