

13 Trentholme Drive
York YO24 1EL

1st November 2015

FAO Planning Committee

Planning Application reference: 15/01202FUL

OBJECTION TO REVISED PLAN OF R A & C LEE, 13 Trentholme Drive

IMPACT ON HERITAGE ASSETS (pp 7-8; 4.6-4.14)

- We object particularly to paras. 4.9-4.12 and the first sentence of 4.14
- 4.9-4.12: a proposed building need not be within the conservation area to raise the issue of harm, which is an issue here. See also Finch objection – no Heritage Statement etc.
- 4.9 “sufficiently divorced not to detract”. Challenged.
- 4.10 shows the extreme proximity. “large villas in their own grounds along Tadcaster road”. See the objections of Mr & Mrs Goddard (no. 145 The Mount). The relevance of so-called villas on Tadcaster road / The Mount and references to “Roman Heritage” are irrelevant and inaccurate. It is very significant at lines 5-7 of para 4.18 p.10 that the designed intention is not intended to fit in with the surroundings of Trentholme Drive.
- 4.11 the inference of “lack of interest” is challenged. No evidence in support is produced.

DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS (pp 9-11; 4.15-4.21)

- The aim of the applicant : “villas – Mount – Roman Heritage” has been challenged above.
- We do not ask the sub-committee to “impose styles or particular tastes” – the applicants do.
- “Not stifling innovation ...” versus “local distinctiveness”. This is to be a decision between factors of equal weight. Objecting to present proposals is not stifling innovation. See also the Finch objection (1st Nov): p1, section 2. We fully agree with this and I do not repeat it.
- 4.20 makes no reference in terms of height to the impact on No.2 Trentholme Drive (see Finch above.)
- In addition, “transition point” is misconceived. There would be no transition except with the house next door, no. 145 The Mount.
- No reference is given for importing the concept of “transition” in support of the officer’s recommendation.
- There is total omission of consideration of the impact in terms of Residential Amenity (pp.11-12: 4.23-4.26) on Trentholme Drive.
- Facing Tadcaster Road the height of no.145 will be emphasised and reinforced by, immediately to the front, a 3-storey cuboid structure of nearly the same height (see plans).
- Mr and Mrs Goddard (no.145 The Mount) have put in their objection both generally and by reference to the potential impact on their own loss of amenity (p.10 4.18-4.19).

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

- Please see comments above and objections of other residents. We note that the consultation response by DC and SD use these words: “existing house is a charming detached building which shows the ‘sheltering’ qualities of the locally distinctive architecture. Proposal is over-scaled and too high for the site, architecturally it could be anywhere so it fails to respond to existing character or respect scale and materials.”.
- Despite minor modifications this opinion remains true.

CONCLUSION

- The collective view of objecting residents is, therefore, that this is the wrong building on this particular sensitive site. This does not mean that we or they are opposed to any development on this site.
- The current proposal does not meet the stringent requirements of statute and regulation.

Ross and Clare Lee