Thorn, Steve

From: planningadvice@sholland.gov.uk
Sent: 29 July 2010 15:57
To: _planningadvice
Subject: Consultation Comments Received - H02-0502-08

COMMENTS

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
29 JUL 2010

H02-0502-08

Comments have been received on the above application via the website and have been transfered into Ocella.

The comments are as follows:

Consultee Number: 1
Consultee Name: Louise Jennings - Historic Environment *Officer*
Address: Lincolnshire County Council Historic Environment Team
Consultee Type: STD
Date Transferred:
Planning Officer: LM

Comments:

Hi,

This is a copy of an email I sent on 2/6/2008 to Gary Taylor and Paul Cope-Faulkner of Archaeological Project Services, an additional copy was sent to Chris Crew at South Holland DC. I did follow this up with Archaeological Project Services a few months later but have not recieved a revised report. This report is unacceptable and in my opinion does not fulfill the requirements of the planning condition.

Dear Gary/ Paul,

Thanks for the copy of the building recording report for the above site. I have a few concerns about this report that I would like to see addressed before I accept the report, I felt that the report was a little light.

You state that the building was built in 1793, as the inscribed plaque states but is this actually the case, I am aware that the Listing Description also states this. Is the inscription original to the house, where is the inscription, was it not worth a photograph. If it is original to the house is there evidence that it was put there in the initial building of the cottage or does it represent later alterations, or even just for decoration?

In the historical setting the map evidence shows that the street is lined on both sides in 1676 but only on one in 1831, I take it you are speaking about the opposite side of the road no longer being there in 1831 not that this side was absent. Im not sure the text makes this explicit. I agree that this could be taken as evidence that this house is built over a previous house, however was there

any evidence that this current building may either partially rebuilt or incorporates fabric from the earlier building?

Although there is a map at 1:2500 there does not appear to be a smaller scale map. This report should contain a site location map annotated with the direction of the external photographs.

Is there a picture of the building before the roof was removed. Additionally Plate 1 and 2 are not of sufficient size or quality to be able to see any detail on them at all. Are there any general site shots without people obscuring the building. With regards to Plates 4, 5 and 6 which part of the roof do the show?

The plan of the roof only shows the two side purlins and one roof purlin, I am presuming that these were not part of the modern roof (do we have a date for the re- roofing, did the owner know?) where there any rafters predating the modern alterations? If so why are these not annotated on the plan, what was the distance between the rafters. Was there any evidence of a roof predating this one? With only three small photographs of the roof it is difficult to feel that it has been adequately recorded, are there any more photographs? Is there for example a picture of the ridge purlin.

In addition I'm also having problems reconciling your measurements for the wall, I may have misunderstood so please bare with me. You state that the walls are 0.5m thick, which seems very substantial for such a humble building, and then there is a space of 0.4m to the lathe and plaster walls, That is 0.9m from the outside wall to the inside wall? this seems huge, could you check your measurements please.

And finally no Oasis report enclosed.

Please contact me if there are any problems

Best Wishes

Louise
Also sent to Chris Crew at South Holland District Council
