

c/o Blakett, Hart & Pratt,LLP
Aire House
Mandale Business Park
Belmont
Durham, DH1 1TH

22 May 2023

Dear Ms White,

DM/23/00911/LB & DM/23/00993/FPA 90 Gilesgate Durham DH1 1HY

Loft conversion including a glass dormer window in centre of roof, with 3x conservation velux windows. Convert and extend the existing garage to a 1.5 storey garden room, with 2x dormer windows

1. The Trust objects to both these applications based on the negative impact of the dormer, the demolition of the existing garden building and the erection of a new garden room.
2. Gilesgate is an historic thoroughfare and is important for the quality of its buildings and linear streetscape formed from individual buildings and short terraces. The property is Grade 2 listed and an important component of the streetscape dominating the corner with West View. The house was originally built in 1760 and the listing specifically mentions the roof, right chimney, and gable.
3. The rear building is a pleasing and interesting square shape with pyramidal roof and central vent. It is shown on the 1857 OS map. It was one of a range of farm, domestic and residential buildings lying behind the buildings lining Gilesgate. Based on local information, Nos. 89 and 90 were one house at this time and the outbuilding belonged to it. The houses were subsequently divided, as was the outbuilding, half of which remains with the neighbouring property.
4. Notwithstanding later modifications, the Trust considers the building to be both of interest and as a remnant of previous uses to the rear of Gilesgate. It should be considered as one building despite its ownership division and is an important adjunct to, and part of the setting of, the listed building. It is therefore significant in its relationship to the character of the conservation area.

Proposal and Impact

5. **The dormer** proposed is of an uncompromising contemporary frameless glass design. This sits very uncomfortably in the roof and the roofscape to the rear of the property. It is now a corner building and the listing referenced gable and roof are on view from both Gilesgate and West View.

The demolition creates a very incongruous split in **the rear building** and offers no clear solution to halving the central vent. It destroys the simple pyramid design that is seen from West View. The insertion of the overlarge 1.5 storey building creates a very disparate pairing against the retained part of the building. It is overly dominant both in relation to No 89 next door and specifically No 90 as a listed building. The rear building should be regarded as an essential part of the setting of the listed building despite later extensions. The Trust is at a loss to understand how, practically, the

THE CITY OF DURHAM TRUST

major redevelopment of the rear curtilage building can be undertaken without destroying the remaining part of the building. It is clearly an unworkable proposal, and there is no evidence submitted that demonstrates an agreed solution to splitting the building with the owner of the other half.

6. The submitted heritage analysis fails to identify adequately the back history of the rear building and the impact of partial demolition on the unity of this single building. It does not deal adequately with the significance of the listed building and its setting.

7. The Trust considers that the negative impact of the building demolition, new garden building and contemporary dormer are not offset by any benefits and are inappropriate changes to this listed building.

Policies

8. The Trust considers that the proposals fail against the following planning policies:

County Durham Plan

Policy 29 Sustainable Design

a. The proposals fail to contribute positively to an area's heritage significance and townscape.

Policy 44 Historic Environment

Designated Assets

The proposals do not demonstrate that this listed asset is to be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to less than substantial harm to its significance.

Listed Buildings

b. The proposals fail to show respect for the historic form, materials, detailing, and curtilage, which contribute to the significance of the building.

c. The proposals fail to demonstrate the retention of the character and special interest of the building when considering alternative use as apartments.

Conservation Areas

f. The proposals fail to demonstrate understanding of the significance, character, appearance and setting of the conservation area and how this has informed proposals to achieve high quality sustainable development, which is respectful of historic interest, local distinctiveness and the conservation or enhancement of heritage assets.

g. The proposals fail to demonstrate the manner in which the proposal responds positively to the findings and recommendations of conservation area character appraisals and management proposals.

h. The proposals do not respect reinforcement of the established, positive characteristics of the area in terms of appropriate design (including pattern, layout, density, massing, features, height, form, materials, and detailing).

Durham City Neighbourhood Plan

Policy S1: Sustainable Development Requirements of all Development and Redevelopment Sites Including all New Building, Renovations and Extensions

The proposal fails because it does not:

c) Harmonise with its context in terms of scale, and height.

THE CITY OF DURHAM TRUST

d) Conserve the significance of the setting, character, local distinctiveness, and the contribution made to the sense of place by Our Neighbourhood's designated and non-designated heritage assets.

Policy H2: The Conservation Areas, Durham City Conservation Area

The development proposals negatively affect the Durham City Conservation Area by not considering, and meeting, the following requirements,

- a) Sustaining and enhancing the historic and architectural qualities of buildings
- b) Sustaining and enhancing continuous frontages, street patterns, boundary treatments, floorscapes and roofscapes.
- c) Respecting historic boundaries and curtilages.
- d) Avoiding demolition of assets of historic and/or architectural interest which contribute to the character and appearance of the area.
- e) Avoiding harm to an element of an asset which makes a positive contribution to its individual significance and that of the surrounding area.
- i) Having appropriate scale, massing, and form.
- j) Having, detailing appropriate to the vernacular, context, and setting.
- k) Using high quality design sympathetic to the character and context of the local area and its significance and distinctiveness.

Based on these policy failures the Trust objects to the proposals as currently submitted.

Yours sincerely

John Lowe,
Chair, City of Durham Trust