

From: [Diana Harvey](#)
To:
Cc:
Subject: The Grey House
Date: 15 September 2021 10:10:59

Dear John

Last night we discussed the Grey House at the meeting of the HW Planning Committee. We were pleased to see the modifications that have been made but there were a couple of areas where we felt that clarification was needed in order for us to make an informed response to the application. In order to do this we have asked HDC for a short extension to the expiry date and why I am writing to you now.

As ever, the mass of the building is the cause of confusion both to ourselves and to the members of the community who chose to attend the meeting in order to make representation. This lies in the exact modifications you have made to the height and square footage of the building from the original drawings through to the second, current application and now to the variation. The overlays that you provide are helpful but would it be possible to produce an overlay showing all three variations of the building in one drawing. Maybe the use of different coloured outlines would be helpful. Is it also possible to remove all detail – windows, doors, etc and just retain an outline. I think the confusion in part has arisen because we are not sure whether you are comparing the revised plan with the original or the current version.

You also say that you have reduced the overall height of the building ‘by approximately 2.3m at the South corner of the site and this reduction continues across all elevations.’ This implies that the roof height has been reduced throughout the whole building. If this is the case, as part of the building is only two storeys we are wondering why the height has been reduced in this area, if indeed it has. Second question, has the reduction been achieved in part by taking away the top roof ridge and introducing flat areas of roof in some places. Your clarification would be appreciated.

Moving to the square footage of the different floor levels, using your own designations to differentiate between the three versions of the plans, in terms of square footage, can you explain how the area of the second floor increases from 1276sqm in the original plan to 1289sqm in the current plan. We understand that this reduces in the revised plan by the removal of 5 rooms and a day area but it appears to give an inflated difference between the current plan and the revised plan by the increase in the current plan over the original plan. In plain language the figures go from 1276 (original) to 1289 (current) to 1073 (revised). Difficult to explain but I hope you understand what I am saying.

Can you also please clarify whether the footprint of the building has moved in any way in the revised plan. The current plan moved considerably from the original version, both away from Carbarry and also towards the back of the site and it does seem as if there has been movement again in the revised plan. Your response would be helpful on this point.

Thank you for your patience in this and it would be helpful if you could provide answers to our questions in the next day or two in order that we can put together our comments in an informed way.

Best wishes

Diana