

Jane Tucker

Subject: Application 3/2018/0220 & 0221 - Thornbers, Waddington
Attachments: THORNBERS RESPONSE.pdf; internal_wall_insulation_application_guide.pdf; site_mix_lime_screed_amp_wearing_surface_for_use_with_technopor.pdf; Ventrolla - Brochure - Bespoke New Timber Windows.pdf; Ventrolla - Brochure - Sash Window Renovation.pdf; PGB-2931_Proposed_20.07.18.pdf

From: Peter Bamber [mailto:peter@pgb-arch.com]
Sent: 20 July 2018 12:24
To: Adrian Dowd
Cc: Mick Frankish; Garry Miller
Subject: Re: Application 3/2018/0220 & 0221 - Thornbers, Waddington

Adrian

Sorry for the delay in responding; we wanted to be sure we were providing the correct responses which are attached in revised drawing format including a response from Garry Miller. We also include data sheets from Ventrola windows with details on new window construction and existing window repair. New windows will have slim line double glazed units with narrow beads as detailed in their catalogue. We also attach data sheets for insulating the building which now illustrate an holistic approach to the breath-ability of the fabric of the whole building. Works in the 70s introduced new concrete floors with DPMs, new cement based plaster to walls (particularly at ground floor) all of which are having a negative affect on the fabric of the structure probably manifesting itself in rising damp problems in the external walls. Your direction towards the SPAB documents has helped the client understand the need to concentrate on the breath-ability of the whole structure. To this end we are now proposing the complete removal of concrete floors and internal cement plasters and replacing with a lime based floor and wall systems to include a wood fibre insulation and underfloor heating. The walls will similarly include wood fibre insulation finished with lime plaster and vapour permeable emulsions. Preparation of surfaces is important and this is detailed in the attached documents including the importance of how to deal with window/door reveals. The system allows for thinner wood fibre boards in these reveals thus ensuring the breath-ability of these without affecting the appearance of the window frames. The use of wood fibre also allows us to replicate the existing curved reveals. Existing internal impermeable paint finishes to stone window reveals will be carefully removed and cleaned (without damage to the stone) - again to return some breath-ability into the fabric. The underfloor heating will maintain a core temperature in the breathable walls/floors thus assisting in ensuring that condensation is not occurring on surfaces which will damage the historic fabric.

We note your appeal decision attachments and have not been certain of the implication of this, however in response; we have now adjusted the location of the frame-less glass link to reduce its surface area significantly and; so we do not affect the fabric of the older parts of the property. The glass link being very short does not need to be artificially lit and will also use none reflective glass as will the glass to the kitchen link. Please be more specific if the appeal documents implied something else.

We have adapted the windows in line with our telephone discussion to use sliding sashes without glazing bars and 8 panel fixed lights either side. We have however kept and propose to refurbish the existing sliding sash within WF01 because of its age and; whilst this appears to be a window from another building just fitted into this gap without too much care, we still feel it is an important story to this listed building - if you disagree and would prefer to match the proposed sliding sashes then please let us know.

We acknowledge your concern with regard to the subdivision of bedroom 3 and propose a 1750 high privacy screen so that the original shape of the room is retained

We have reintroduced the original stable doors into the garage which helps strengthen the dividing wall and therefore allows us to provide a door between the two spaces in a more sensible location. If the fold back timber doors should look more like original stable doors then please advise. We have also tried to create a more agricultural feel with similar bi-folding screen to the original cart shed opening.

We understand a further extension of time will be required to determine the application and to this end agree to a date of Friday 17th Aug 2018

Please do not hesitate to contact us to discuss any further changes which will lead to a successful application.

Kind regards



Peter Bamber
DIRECTOR

PGB Architectural Services LTD. Lily Cottage,
12 Glen Avenue, Knowle Green, Preston. PR3 2ZQ

07866 366 565 01254 82 00 92 pgb-arch.com

On 15 May 2018 at 17:30, Adrian Dowd <Adrian.Dowd@ribblevalley.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Peter,

Application 3/2018/0220 & 0221

Thornbers, Waddington – listed Grade II

I write in respect to the above applications under consideration by the Borough Council and following our site meeting of 3 May 2018.

Following further reference to the submitted information, I would be grateful for your consideration to the following matters:

The Heritage Statement identifies that the main range of the building is of High Significance because it encapsulates the original cruck structure and shows clear evidence of cladding in the C17 (the C17 east gable window is ‘the only major external clue to an earlier date’) and late C18-early C19 adaptation. The C19 former stable and C19 single storey porch are important but of less significance. A link between the former stables and the main range is

proposed in C17 fabric (close to the east gable and its window). Can a link be created which avoids loss to fabric of High Significance?

The Heritage Statement identifies that the former cartshed/garage is of medium significance and '*probably the earliest of the outbuildings, likely to be late 18th-early 19th century*'. The alterations made in 3/1993/0641 provided access between the outbuildings and the main range. I also note from 3/1993/0641 that the garden room east wall has subsequently been removed which was not shown on the approved plans. I would therefore reiterate concerns expressed at pre-application stage that proposed wall demolition works further undermine the planform legibility of these significant outbuildings.

I welcome proposals discussed on site to minimise the impact of new fenestration in the former stables, cartshed/garage and garden room (extent of glazing and number of lights to the former ancillary building windows which competes with the higher status main range). For information, I attach a link to Historic England advice and recent appeals.

<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/adaptive-reuse-traditional-farm-buildings-advice-note-9/>

<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/adapting-traditional-farm-buildings/>

<https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/caring-for-heritage/rural-heritage/farm-buildings/>

Mindful of the loss of character to the front elevation of the former stables resulting from 3/1993/0641, has consideration been made to possible enhancement from restoration of the tall and narrow doorways? (stables are discussed at page 66 of <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-farmsteads-preliminary-character-statement-north-west/>).

I would be grateful for the submission of further information concerning the significance of existing windows and how this has informed proposed replacements. I recall from pre-application discussions that there was speculation as to whether window WF.01 was original to this house? Why does proposed window WG.03 not conform to that shown in Figure 6 of the Heritage Statement? Are windows WG.02 and WG.04 based upon historic windows or is there enough evidence to suggest replacements follow the style of WF.01? The 8-pane side windows to WG.03 (Figure 6) appear in proportion and in line with the central light – is there enough evidence to suggest the 6-pane 1970s side windows throughout the elevation could be replaced with 8-pane?

I am concerned that the proposed window beads referred to at page 4 of the Planning Statement will not safeguard the character of prominent front elevation windows (see Historic England advice in respect to the replacement of windows <https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/traditional-windows-care-repair-upgrading/>).

The proposed removal of a historic ceiling (page 6 of Planning Statement) is justified with reference to a possible previous use of this element as a barn. Mindful of the C17 window in the east gable I would be grateful for further evidence and justification in this regard.

I note from page 8 of the Planning Statement that walls and floors are damp. I also note existing modern pointing, plasterwork and floors – effect on ‘breathability’? I understand from Historic England and SPAB advice that works for damp proofing and insulation are likely to be complicated – please provide further information/justification in respect to proposed damp amelioration proposals.

<https://www.historicengland.org.uk/advice/technical-advice/energy-efficiency-and-historic-buildings/>

<https://www.spab.org.uk/advice/breathability-and-old-buildings>

<https://www.spab.org.uk/advice/energy-efficiency-old-buildings>

<http://ihbconline.co.uk/context/90/#13/z>

Proposed Bed 3 would appear to be the only First Floor room which has retained its original proportions (C17 or earlier). As discussed on site, I would therefore welcome further consideration to retaining this important element of planform in the proposed works.

However, these are my opinions as an officer of the Borough Council which will not prejudice any decision of the Borough Council.

Thank you,

Adrian Dowd BSc (Hons) MA (URP) MA (Arch Cons) RTPI IHBC

Principal Planning Officer

Ribble Valley BC

Tops for resident satisfaction – 94% of residents are satisfied with Ribble Valley as a place to live (Perception Survey 2016)

Happiest residents in the UK – Ribble Valley has a ‘happiness rating’ of 8.2 compared to a UK average of 7.5 (Halifax Rural Quality of Life Survey 2016)

This transmission is intended for the named addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, protectively marked or restricted material, and should be handled accordingly. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee) you may not copy, use, or disclose it to anyone else. If you have received this transmission in error, notify the sender immediately. All GCSX traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation. This e-mail is issued subject to Ribble Valley Borough Council’s e-mail [disclaimer](#) which you are taken to have read and accepted.

Although the Council virus scans incoming and outgoing emails (including file attachments) it cannot guarantee that the content of an email communication or any file attachment is virus free or has not been intercepted or amended as it passes over the internet. The onus is on the recipient to check the communication is virus-free. The Council accepts no responsibility for any damage caused by receiving emails from our email systems and/or hosted domains.