

## **Corrections and Amendments 24/P/01681 and 24/P/01682**

Since the publication of the committee reports for applications 24/P/01681 and 24/P/01682, Officers have been contacted by the Georgian Group.

The Group rebut the assertions stated on pages 84, 96, 201 and 204 of the agenda. They note that at no time has the Georgian Group insisted on a full restoration of Clandon Park. The Group note that offering an opinion on whether a full restoration should be undertaken is not the purpose of the Group's role as a statutory consultee. They have submitted an analysis of the scheme and a professional judgement on the level of harm caused by the proposals.

On this basis, the following changes (deletions) to the reports should be noted by Members:

### **24/P/01681**

Page 84 (last paragraph) – 'It is noted that one of the most controversial aspects of this application is the diametrically opposing views about how the Mansion House should be treated going forward. It is acknowledged that there is a large body of those objecting to the scheme, ~~including for example, the Georgian Group~~ which seem to advocate (although some more forcefully than others) that only the full and complete restoration of the Mansion is acceptable. At the other end of the spectrum are those which feel that the building should be left as a complete ruin without the protection which is currently afforded to the structure in the form of the temporary roof and wall coverings. As already explained above, the applicant's approach is different again.'

Page 96 (last paragraph) – 'While not the full restoration of the building which is being advocated by some, ~~including the Georgian Group~~, the proposal includes a variety of works which would help to secure the existing fabric of the building, post-fire, and restore some important features, into the long term. This includes the preservation of the building's facades, the reinstatement of all windows, the provision of a new roof and repairs and maintenance work to stop water ingress etc. As such, the external appearance of the house, which is the most important aspect of the structure's significance to survive would be preserved for generations to come'.

### **24/P/01682**

Page 201 (second full paragraph) – 'It is noted that one of the most controversial aspects of this application is the diametrically opposing views about how the Mansion House should be treated going forward. It is acknowledged that there is a large body of those objecting to the scheme, ~~including for example, the Georgian Group~~ which seem to advocate (although some more forcefully than others) that only the full and complete restoration of the Mansion is acceptable. At the other end of the spectrum are those which feel that the building should be left as a complete ruin without the protection which is currently afforded to the structure in the form of the temporary roof and wall coverings. As already explained above, the applicant's approach is different again.'

Page 204 (second paragraph) – 'While not the full restoration of the building which is being advocated by some, ~~including the Georgian Group~~, the proposal includes a variety of works which would help to secure the existing fabric of the building, post-fire, and restore some important features, into the long term. This includes the preservation of the building's facades, the reinstatement of all windows, the provision of a new roof and repairs and maintenance work to stop water ingress etc. As such, the external appearance of the house, which is the most important aspect of the structure's significance to survive would be preserved for generations to come'.

