

Planning comment and response tracker  
**FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES ONLY**

Sir William Fox Hotel: Planning Comment & Response Tracker:

The tracker is to record and respond to queries to the planning application and is **issued for information purposes only**, not an application document.

Query No.	Query	Response
1	Firstly, can I ask you to clarify the inclusion of caretakers office and accommodation. The application form identifies that the 6 apartments would be for market sale. As such I would question the inclusion of this for private properties?	The application is for seven apartments and the caretakers reference is to be amended to 'apartment 2'. All properties will be for market sale. The application form and reference is to be amended to show seven apartments rather than six.
2	The application form (Q16) states that there are no trees adjacent to the proposed development site. However, this is incorrect as there is a large mature tree located within the boundaries of no. 6 Westoe Village. I am seeking guidance from Tree colleagues of the need for an accompanying tree survey report and will advise you further on this in due course. The application form will also need to be amended in due course to accurately reflect the position on site.	Agreed, the application form should be amended to reference that the tree to 6 Westoe Village is recognised.
3	Drawing no. RES736-BHA-00-22-DR-A-3010 rev P01.03 states that there are no works proposed to the side elevation facing no. 6 and refers to no access being granted to carry out survey work. However Drg RES736-BHA-00-22-DR-A-3001 rev P01.04 shows new egress windows proposed within the elevation. There are therefore inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the plans.	The windows have been omitted from the amended plans 1501 Rev P1.05 and elevations 1601 Rev P1.04 so no egress is required to the side elevation and will be left unaffected by the proposals.
4	The occupiers of no. 6 have advised that 'no access to the neighbouring side was ever sought'. The egress windows would be directly onto their property and raise concern that a person/s could step directly into their walled garden from which there is no way out, other than over two further garden walls (nos 7 and 8) to reach a locked private doorway to Salters Trod. I would welcome your response to this, to enable me to respond to the occupiers of no. 6.	Refer to response 3.

5	<p>As such. I would ask that the plans be amended to remove the additional windows proposed and the plans amended to introduce appropriate ventilation. Should advice need to be sought due to the listed status of the building, please advise and I can seek guidance from my Historic Environment colleague. Please note that further comments in respect of ventilation are set out below.</p>	<p>Refer to response 3.</p>
6	<p><i>This Grade II Listed property is currently subdivided into a number of bedrooms and en-suites that have in the past led to the loss of the original floorplan. When we carried out a site visit to the property several months ago, it was clear that very few historic features remain as a result of this previous conversion. As such, I do not object to the principle of the development and indeed some of the proposals could in fact lead to an enhancement in the appearance of the building (e.g. replacement of plastic windows with timber sashes). However, despite pre-application discussions through which I expressed the need for further clarification on a number of details, I am unable to support the application with the level of information that is currently provided.</i></p> <p><i>I would start by offering the view that older buildings generally work better when the number of sub-divisions is kept to a minimum. I would have liked to have seen fewer apartments and internal subdivisions, although I accept that the scheme must be financially viable. Can you please provide some clarification on the number of apartments proposed.</i></p>	<p>The internal fabric of the building is fairly devoid of any original elements visible due to the historic works that have done in forming the hotel accommodation. The communal staircase is an element that would be worthy of retention and refurbishment and a strategy is outlined in the Material Schedule and Strategy Document with a proposed commentary.</p> <p>The proposed development density is for seven apartment dwellings that in the main work with the existing structural wall positions within the building with existing non loadbearing walls removed and the introduction of new walls to form the apartments internal rooms. The scale of density suits the size of building and is of a density that makes the conversion works financially viable and ensuring the building has an extended lifespan.</p>
7	<p><i>Removal of render: a detailed methodology is required, including making provision for re-rendering in a lime based mortar. The process of removal could damage the face of the masonry and require it to be protected by a layer of lime</i></p>	<p>Please refer to the Material Schedule and Strategy Document for proposed commentary.</p>

	<p><i>render. Alternatively, there may be areas of existing render that ought to be left if it is clear it simply can't be removed without damaging the underlying masonry. I would suggest basing the methodology on the detailed guidance provided by the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB): <a href="https://www.spab.org.uk/advice/lime-renders-vs-cement-renders">https://www.spab.org.uk/advice/lime-renders-vs-cement-renders</a> We will require a specification of the lime mortar and methodology for its application (one for render and another for repointing). The mix and specification are critical as non-specialist contractors often do not have the experience required to work with lime and the instructions must therefore be explicit.</i></p>	
8	<p><i>I appreciate that the proposal to rationalise SVPs and aerals is likely to improve the overall appearance of the property. We will require details of how the masonry be repaired (e.g. masonry to match, lime mortar). I would suggest this be included in the method statement for removal of render.</i></p>	<p>Please refer to the Material Schedule and Strategy Document for proposed commentary.</p>
9	<p><i>Caretaker's office sleeping space: is this a residential unit in its own right? If so, where is the kitchen area and associated mechanical and electrical, and is the basement area marked 'store' actually to be a bedroom? Should this be the case, we need full details of how it is proposed to make this below ground room habitable. Notes on this have been previously provided.</i></p>	<p>Refer to response 1. It is now referenced as 'apartment 2' in drawing 1501 Rev P1.05 which illustrates the kitchen and bathroom to the rear of the building as part of the converted single storey lean to offshoot and as a single storey extension. The basement is to be converted to bedroom accommodation for the apartment - please refer to the Material Schedule and Strategy Document for proposed commentary and drawing 1702 Rev P01.</p>
10	<p><i>Details of mechanical and electrical installation (kitchen flues, new plumbing for bathrooms, etc.) are inadequate. What will be the level of intervention in the historic fabric (new openings/finishes/materials). Will original floorboards need to be lifted, or plasterwork interfered with? Even if this is not the case, the application should clarify such points. SVPs should not penetrate the roofline.</i></p>	<p>Please refer to the Material Schedule and Strategy Document for proposed commentary.</p>

11	<i>Details of fire separation method to main stairwell: none have been submitted. Sections, materials, etc. are required. Annotated photographs would be particularly useful so that we can see what features, if any, may be affected.</i>	Please refer to the Material Schedule and Strategy Document for proposed commentary.
12	<i>Velux rooflights must be conservation type, flush with the roofline and their size kept to minimum. The rooflight to apartment 6 is excessive. Technical details must be submitted.</i>	The second floor apartment 7 will have two rooflights added to the existing roof structure and finish to provide daylight to the second bedroom and bathroom positions. The rooflight will be a conservation type by the Rooflight Company which has a low-profile frame which will sit in the immediate plane of the roof pitch so the light is unobtrusive to the roof and sized to an appropriate proportion in relation to the adjacent dormers to Westoe Village elevation and window proportions to the building façade – 1288mm(h) x 837mm(w). <a href="https://www.therooflightcompany.co.uk/all-products/conservation/">https://www.therooflightcompany.co.uk/all-products/conservation/</a>
13	<i>Suggest the ‘traditional’ hardwood panel door proposed to the rear offshoot should be of a design more in keeping with the 6 panelled door to the principle elevation for consistency, as should the proposed rear communal door.</i>	The new doors providing access to the rear communal entrance off the car park and the entrance door to apartment 3 off the car park area are to be hardwood traditional 6-panel door to a similar appearance to the 6-panel front door off Westoe Village. The door is to be paint finished in black.
14	<i>The stairwell extension to the rear abuts the party wall. There isn’t nearly enough detail and certainly annotated photographs would be useful. Will the existing wall be undermined by the proposals? How is the staircase to be tied into the masonry? How will the weather protection above external staircase be tied in to the masonry and what materials are being proposed?</i>	Please refer to the Material Schedule and Strategy Document for proposed commentary.
15	<i>Scale drawings demonstrating the width of frames to proposed timber windows will need to be submitted. It is virtually impossible to reproduce fine Georgian glazing bars in double glazed units. These units generally fail fairly quickly despite guarantees from manufacturers. Assuming the developer wishes to install double glazed units, I would therefore suggest that the window design be amended to a one-over-one arrangement (no glazing bars) and that the</i>	The existing upvc and single glazed window casements are proposed to be removed and replaced with new timber framed double glazed casements. We accept the suggestion of using a ‘one over one’ sliding sash configuration and have amended the proposed elevation drawing 1601 Rev P1.04. The frame profile will use a traditional sliding sash profile and propose to provide details on the profile as part of a planning condition submission once a manufacturer / supplier is selected.

Planning comment and response tracker  
**FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES ONLY**

	<i>dimensions of the frames mirror those of the windows on the principle elevation.</i>	
16	<i>Samples of all materials will need to be approved and all rainwater goods and SVPs should be cast iron or aluminium.</i>	All new rainwater downpipes and gutters to be aluminium, finished black, and are to be of similar half round gutter profile and circular downpipe to existing. Refer to the Material Schedule document for commentary.