

Subject: RE: Historic England Report

From: bob pearson
Sent: 24 July 2021 12:06
To: Laine, Christopher; Patel, Kreena
Cc: bob pearson; Tricia Power
Subject: Historic England Report

Dear Chris

I appreciate your advisory role from a Heritage point of view and I hope you appreciate the position which we (the residents) are in.

We have some questions and concerns regarding your report. I have copied in Kreena as these points will be important to the Council's assessment process as well.

- 1) We are not sure why you state the development will only use the existing building foundation lines. There will be approximately 60m of new foundation lines required in areas that either have a base layer of Tarmac or are currently grass. We assume this level of excavation will require the Council, as part of the statutory process, to inform the G.L.A.S authority as noted in your report. Your note that the new building's space will be achieved by "infilling the areas between the existing buildings" is not accurate or possible. We are not sure of the significance of this point, but we are very concerned that within the Application overall, misleading statements are constantly made which hide the true impact of the building. Please See "MOL Build Plot" diagram in the Application to clarify the two points we make here.
- 2) The report mentions the Marble Hill House Conservation Plan reference to the impact of "parked cars creating a visual intrusion" and therefore we assume that any increase in car park size would be unacceptable from a Heritage point of view.

Kreena - the additional traffic created from the Playcentre/Community Hub will have no option but to use the local roads to park as they often do now which creates traffic and pedestrian safety issues around the area directly outside the park by the pedestrian crossing along to the St Stephens Church area. The traffic report submitted by the applicant is fatally flawed in the stated assumption that "the majority of people using the park arrive on public transport". This is not true and is, we believe, a blatant attempt to hide a serious issue. This point is then confirmed by the Applicant stating throughout their justification that usage will increase to 365 days a year with a multi-use community centre specifically designed for SEND children, with music classes will also being held, all requiring a significant increase in car transportation and parking on site.

- 3) Protected views – The current plans including the sketches and elevations are incorrect and misleading and we assume that you have made a best case approximate judgement. We have detailed all the issues regarding the Plans and Elevations submitted (published on the Council website) and so far our concerns remain unchallenged or answered. And to clarify with more detail your comment in the report "the building is generally higher" a large part of the building will be increased from 5.4m to 6.750m (25% higher) a point that is not clear in the current Plans or

Sightline sketches (in one sketch hidden by a giant Bird !) Our consultants developed a 3D model and in doing so had to correct the mistakes made in the Sketches and Elevations diagrams. Would you like access to our Architect to understand the issues and mistakes made? .

Kreena - A point we have made many times and one that English Heritage and our ward Councillor now confirm - the plans are sub-standard and were produced by the architect on a pro-bono basis for the Applicant. We have referenced many serious errors and untruths in the design and throughout the Application which remain unchallenged and unanswered. Historic England are using the current Plans to determine the protected views and also to reference issues for Interpretation at a later date. This surely is not acceptable with any planning application but especially with one of such significance. I appreciate that you have not evaluated all the detail yet but we cannot see why the plans/application should not be rejected as there are many material issues we have raised that remain unanswered and must not be ignored or left to future Interpretation. We (and the general public) are now dependant on your department's professional assessment process.

Kind Regards

Bob