

320160412P

PROPOSED  
TWO STOREY EXTENSION  
WITH GABLET WINDOW  
AT  
AUSTIN HOUSE  
MALT KILN LANE  
CHIPPING  
DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT  
WITH  
SUPPORTING ADDENDUM

## ADDENDUM

This application follows securing planning permission for a two storey extension (application No 3/2016/0171) and our letter with supporting contents requesting advise to further improve the secured application with scheme 1 & 2 and planning advise there on.

Following advise and in particular scheme 1 the original statements are re-presented with amended drawings.

We have determined the additional width to ground and first floor amended layouts area approximately 50% of the approved basement area,

Therefore this application omits the basement, because its loss is mitigated by the additional width proposed and construction cost savings will be satisfactory.

The proposed gable window shall be the same size as the existing , and addition width is controlled by the existing B1-secting roof valley.

## ASSESSMENT

The attached Heritage Statement produced by Peter De Figueiredo (Historic Building Adviser) provides a comprehensive historical appraisal of Austin House property

Originally produced for previously refused Planning Application No 3-2011-0589P and now forms part of this present application

The report provides a Planning History on previous applications, prior to the Kirk Mill area (including Austin House) being designated a conservation area in February 2010

The report also illustrates the way Austin House relates to the landscape in a series of views from Malt Kiln Lane moving east and west in particular its concealment and intermittent viewing location by general landscape screening.

Historically the property was originally a farmhouse with attached out building barn, that has subsequently been extended with a number of various additions over a number of years culminating in its present day form

Referring to the attached Heritage Statement "Identification of Cultural Significance" 5.2.1. states the process of extension and enhancement has continued in recent years with the work carried out by the present owner. This process of change, which is common in rural areas, reflects the rise in status of property owners and their life styles.

In this instance the property has been allowed to be enlarged and sensitively adapted for the present occupants needs providing continued life and vitality

The occupants (applicants) have young children and plan to extend their family. They also have 2 sets of grand parents who form an integral part of the household as an extension to their family and life style at Austin House.

Under the circumstances the process of change is essential and necessary in the form of extended residential accommodation.

It is appreciated and understood Austin House is in a prominent and positive contributor to the character appearance and significance of Kirk Mill Conservation Area.

sfb 22/02/14

It also appreciated the pond side location is of importance to the setting of the designated listed building

The council consider historical extensions of Austin House have marred this contribution to architectural and historic interest of the designated listing , which includes remodelling of the front elevation and what is considered unsympathetic additions to the rear and west gables i.e. the orangery

The council additionally claim the east gable has been little changed providing integrity to the historic building and one of the principle reasons why the previously proposed extension to this elevation was refused.

From historical fact and statement in the heritage report the east gable has been changed significantly no less than the remodelling of the front elevation, Therefore this particular reasoning of refusal carries little weight.

The council also claim , due to the form and sighting of the proposal . it is considered to be conspicuous , intrusive and of undue harm to the character , appearance and significance of the setting and significance of the listed building (Mill Pond)

Relating to the case officers report 6.2.3. (V) "This does not account for the public right of way (F.P.1) which skirts the site or the impermanence of garden hedging

This is not the case ? The public footpath (F.P.1) is significantly distant from Austin House proposed extension , in practical terms at least 40.0m at its right angle

The extension comes into view at a distance of 70.0m at the start of the footpath , skirting the garage (which is significantly higher than the proposed extension level) See copy of refused location plan as an illustration.

Therefore in practical terms that can be considered reasonable 6.3.3. suggests that the views of the application site are restricted is correct.

We consider to have made a reasonable argument the previously refused application by virtue the proposal was indeed in conspicuous and of no harm to the character , appearance and significance of Kirk Mill Conservation area.

dp 08/02/14

### PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT LOCATION

Referring to the previously refused statement , heading Proposed Development Option. The Councils Conservation Officer suggested in pre application discussions that he would be prepared to consider a scheme in which the study formed an addition to the rear extension.

On the presumption our statement on location of previously refused extension should have been accepted . It is reasonable to assess an extension to the rear (north elevation) will have a substantially less impact than that at the side (east) following the same principles of applying policy demands by the council planning department.

Indeed the councils Conservation Officer was implying an extension to the rear would be the best way forward as a consideration.

### DESIGN IMPLICATIONS

The house in its present form is an attractive stone building , which has been changed and adapted over several generations.

The extensions to the front and sides have followed lines to emulate the original features of the house as described in the refused statement 6-2-3.

Considering the properties relatively new "Conservation" designation, we accept to extend and attempt a design to emulate preserved features would not enhance and would be considered un-acceptable.

However the construction features to the rear (north) elevation are modern and as such a proposed design would follow the same features.

The proposed design would be a 2 storey extension with additional basement, projecting 4.50 from the rear (north) building line.

Stone and rendered elevations under a projecting blue slate roof

The basement would provide accommodation for the study which does not have to rely on natural light

Ground floor would provide the extended family room and the first floor the additional bedroom

LB. 08/02/14

## DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

We are mindful the property retains some interest and is considered to compliment its position with the newly designated Kirk Mill Conservation area . Opposite the recently Grade 11 listed Kirk Mill pond .

We are also mindful the conservation area designation is primarily concerned with the protection of areas rather than individual buildings.

The hillside to the rear of Austin House is dramatic and forms a pleasing visible backdrop to the millpond and to some extent and in context to Austin House .

It is important we dwell on this issue.

Attached photographs P1-10 which form part of this application , clearly demonstrates the principle commanding view from public footpath (F.P.1) on the hillside to the backdrop is the mill pond.

From the same vantage point Austin House is visible if you are mindful to take views to the west with the property located in a landscape valley, in practical terms and visible impact is incidental and totally subservient to those views of the mill pond

## LOCATION PLANS 001, 002 AND 003

Relating to public footpath (P.F.1) as we understand local knowledge suggests 90% of the footpath users walk northerly over the hill with their backs to the mill pond.

LOCATION PLAN 001 in line with the proposed extension clearly demonstrates taking 90 wide angle views solely relate to the mill pond

LOCATION PLAN 002 taking a view 60.0m north (crown of the hill side) illustrates Austin House edging the west wide angle view

LOCATION PLAN 003 illustrates views at a distance of 75.0m (beyond the hillside crown) would show the roof tops of Austin House within the west part of the wide angle view

It should also be noted , the land east and west of the public footpath is private agricultural grazing land, with particular reference to land directly behind Austin House cannot be considered an issue of the proposed extension to Austin House in relation to the mill pond because they could not be viewed in unison

RB 08/02/16

SUMMARY

Due to the form and siting of the proposal we consider it to be inconspicuous, unobtrusive and of undue harm to the character, appearance and significance of Kirk Mill Conservation area, and the setting and significance of the listed building.

The north stone elevation to the extension reduces the visible impact in the distance.

We are satisfied the character, appearance and significance of this area remains intact with our proposals and no harmful benefit to the public.

df 02/02/16