**Response to Conservation Officer comments by Agent - in blue and received 31/10/23**

*As noted, this building is not listed and not in a CA and as such we are treating it as a NDHA.*

*Whilst the proposed individual dormers are an improvement they are still visually heavy (and the middle one unnecessary). I would have preferred to see rooflights on this particular slope as they would not be so visually disruptive or heavy and would not detract from the 5 attractive lattice windows.*I haven't commented on the floor layout / dormers as we discussed this at our site meeting so hopefully this is all as agreed.

*In respect of the treatment of the openings, I don't understand why it is not possible to fix the hayloft door open and rebate the glazing such that this opening still retains its hayloft character.* The opening is not retained as the new internal wall is divides it in half - it wouldn't be possible to fix the hayloft door open as the door would hit the bargeboard due to the narrow width at door head height

*Ditto for the paired double doors - any reason why they could not be fixed open? -* the double doors could be fixed open *I would also hope that the lattice window on the east elevation could be retained. -* I'm not sure this is practical as it will be a bedroom and constructed to Building Regs standards and given the single glazed steel frame etc this won't comply.

*In respect of conditions, I would recommend specifying lead for the dormers, metal for RWG and that the exposed rafter feet detail is retained and the barge boards are retained too (or replaced with painted timber). -* Yes, although lead is heavy / expensive / a target for thieves, so maybe an alternative such a zinc or anothe metal, to be decided