Online Comment

Application	H14-0781-23
Location	BRIDGE HOUSE NORTHGATE PINCHBECK PE11 3SE
Proposal	Proposed Replacement Dwelling

Name	Greg Watkinson
Address	Conservation Officer

Date Submitted	03-11-23
For/Against	Objections

The recent amendment to this application does not in any way alter my original stance on this proposal.

No amendment has been proposed to the design. I still consider the proposal to represent an unattractive, incongruous overdevelopment of a sensitive site within relatively close proximity to a prominent listed building.

The applicant's Heritage Impact Assessment states that Bridge House is currently in poor condition and therefore draws upon the character of the setting. It should be noted that disrepair does not represent justification for the demolition of a building within the historic environment, and that Policy 22 of the SELLP specifically seeks to encourage and facilitate the restoration of existing assets in poor condition. Furthermore, the applicant states that the conifer hedge shields the nearby Glen House from any negative impact. The hedging is not subject to any protection under planning legislation and could, in theory, be removed without the need to consult with the LPA. Therefore, I cannot take the existence of the hedge into account in issuing my advice. Finally, I fundamentally disagree with the agent's statement that the proposed design is 'traditional' in any sense. The inclusion of a fairly featureless 3-bay frontage does not represent 'traditional' design overall. Nevertheless, the building would appear shrouded with incongruous and visually obtrusive modern additions, with any 'traditional' elements of the proposed frontage being largely shielded from public views along northgate.

The supplied 'visual structural inspection and report' does not in any way suggest that the original building is incapable of repair, merely supporting the case that there is a substantial amount of work to be carried out to repair it. Furthermore, the agent draws attention to the fact that previous pre-application advice was returned suggesting that the original building is not worthy of retention due to the site not being subject to 'existing preservation or listing orders' - it is true that the building is neither listed nor subject to an article 4, however, it can quite clearly be seen as a non-designated heritage asset.