

whitworth

Chartered Architects & Chartered Building Surveyors  
Bury St Edmunds | [www.whitworth.co.uk](http://www.whitworth.co.uk) | 01284 760 421



WINDOW REPLACEMENT & NEW WINDOW | WOODLANDS, BRUNDISH  
DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

Whitworth Unit 12, Park Farm Business Centre, Fornham St. Genevieve, Bury St. Edmunds, IP28 6TS  
01284 760421 | [info@whitworth.co.uk](mailto:info@whitworth.co.uk) | [www.whitworth.co.uk](http://www.whitworth.co.uk)

This document is to be read in conjunction with all relevant and listed drawings.

This document is copyright of Whitworth and it or no part is to be reproduced or re-used without prior consent of Whitworth.

Whitworth is a trading name of The Whitworth Co-Partnership LLP

Sept 2022

Issue 1

## 1.0 Introduction

---

This statement is written in support of an application for four replacement windows and one new window.

## 2.0 Existing building & Setting

---

The Woodlands is a timber framed aisled hall which dates from the mid-late 13th century, it is of two storey and has a thatched roof. It has seen alteration in the 16th, 18th, 19th and 20th centuries which has resulted in a myriad of window designs, some of have a greater contribution to the buildings significance than others.

The Woodlands is listed at grade I in recognition of its exceptional level of special architectural and historic interest and so falls within the top 2.5% of listed buildings nationally. Its listing description reads as follows:

<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1352226?section=official-list-entry>

Grade: I  
List Entry Number: 1352226  
Date first listed: 18-Dec-1987  
Statutory Address 1: THE WOODLANDS, TANNINGTON ROAD

*“Former farmhouse, probably once a manor house; now divided into 2 dwellings. Mid-late C13 with mid C16 alterations and additions forming a single long range. Timber framed and plastered with remains of ropework-pargetted plaster panels. Thatched roof. 2 storeys. A range of 5 small-paned casement windows of C18-C19 date. C20 thatched entrance porch with boarded door in 2 leaves. To right a small lean-to porch with boarded door. Axial stack with rebuilt shaft; 2 small stacks to left, one against the gable end. The core of the house comprises a 2-bay aisled hall, the aisles rebuilt in narrower form in C16. Only one of the 2 arcade posts in the open truss survives: in section it resembles a rounded square (an unusual form) with a fine moulded capital. One straight brace to the arcade plate survives. The remainder of the open truss is largely intact. There are straight braces from arcade posts to join the rafters of the opposite slope: these are in 2 sections, broken at the tie beam and halved over each other above it. Doubled passing braces clasp the arcade post and the main braces to meet just above collar level. There is an extra tie beam each side of the open truss (one cut through) and 2 over the cross-passage (one removed). Both arcade posts survive in the closed truss at the upper end and the top half of one at the lower end: they are rounded only on the side facing the hall and have remains of moulded half-capitals. The gable wall at the upper end is intact, with passing braces crossing at the apex. The remainder of the structure of the end walls has gone. In the upper bay there is evidence for 2 horizontal ties outwards from the arcade plates: these may have supported gables over the hall windows. Evidence for a former solar cross-wing survives in the form of housing for rafters in the tie beam. The coupled-rafter roof over the hall is intact, as well as the inner ends of the aisle rafters. All members are heavy and well-finished. Inserted floor has plain C16 joists. Mid C16 addition against upper end of hall, the roof-with a single row of clasped purlins. Against the lower end, a larger mid C16 addition set slightly back from the rest of the range and separated from the hall by a C16 stack: good studding with reversed braces, closely-set plain first floor joists, C16 newel stair and a queen-post roof with ridge piece. A rare survival of an aisled hall, of particular importance as the roof is largely unaltered. Remains of moat probably contemporary with hall.”*

The property and its occupants details from Kelly's Directory of Suffolk 1896 lists Samuel Oseland Ray as a farmer occupying Woodlands Farm, an area of 190 acres with his wife and children. But by 1937 the entry in Kelly's shows the land surrounding the farm had reduced to 100 acres and farmed by John William Rush. Which has dwindled further since. After this having been acquired by Tannington Hall/Braiseworth Hall Estates when it was divided into two dwellings and the modern single story addition was added, including sub dividing the main part of the house as shown in the

floor layout plans that were submitted to MSDC in September 2003 for removal of these divisions under LBS/209/03 and approved 25/11/03. Since 2003 these approved alterations have been carried out to make it one dwelling.

The main part of the two storey house has a thatched roof is timber framed surrounded by a moat, house dates from the 13th century with 16th century alterations to timber frame, additions and casement windows. Most of the changes internally have taken place in the 16th century with some further changes in 18th/19th century with a single storey extension added in the 20th century. Its moated surroundings are clearly shown on the O.S. Map 111 Edition dated 1891, but without the later 20th century modern extension of boot/toilet and laundry room.



Front Elevation



Rear Elevation

### 3.0 Proposals

---

The proposal is to replace 4 windows and insert 1 new window.

The application is a secondary application following the withdrawal of DC/21/06528 & DC/21/06529 for 10 replacement windows. During these application there was disagreement over the window conditions between the applicant, agent, Historic England and Conservation Officer over 7 replacement windows. However the replacement of the 4 within this application and the new window were all agreed to. This application therefore seeks to formalise the consultation given on these windows.

The consultation on these is provided in section 3.6 below. This is considered to the justification for this work. Furthermore however the property has been subject to a number of changes over the last 100 years, notably its subdivision to two properties and return to one. Whether as a consequence of this or in tandem the four windows in question are no in keeping with the main house, which has predominately retained its important and significant character. The replacement of these windows will enhance the property and remove some of the undesirable window alterations on the property.

The changes will also allow these 4 windows to be upgraded without damaging the visual appearance with slimlitle double glazing to enhance the buildings energy performance in a small way, which is critical in the current age, whilst still respecting the buildings heritage and overall appearance. This glazing is also endorsed by Historic England.

The new window appearances and details will match those that exist on the property.

For ease of reference the window lettering from the original applications have been kept as before and the windows in question are A, B, E, K and the new window is J.

### 3.1 Use

---

The current property is and will remain a private residence.

### 3.2 Appearance & Materials

---

The buildings overall appearance will be unaffected, Although the works will include the adaption of glazing bar positions.

All windows in question are softwood timber and all new windows will be constructed of the same material. Existing windows are painted and the new windows will also be painted.

Construction details are to be as those submitted.

Glazing is to be 12mm slimlite double glazing.

Ironmongery is to black antique style.

To window J to facilitate its installation a small section of wattle and daub is to be removed (330x750mm). No further historic fabric will be lost and this is considered to be acceptable. The wall has been assessed to be wattle and daub via a visual inspection, which via the wall thickness and visual appearance clearly identifies as such.

### 3.3 Scale, Amount & Layout

---

Scale, Amount and Layout is unaffected by this application.

### 3.4 Access

---

Vehicular access and parking will remain unchanged.

Access to and around the property will be unaffected by the changes.

### 3.5 Landscaping

---

There will be landscaping works undertaken as part of these proposals.

### 3.6 Consultation

---

The consultation on the previous application was spread across a series of responses. The following picks out the key correspondence.

#### **Windows A,B,E,K**

Dated 14.02.2022 Thomas Pinner stated

*“Based upon a site visit, I am satisfied that windows A, B, E and K are likely later C20 additions of no particular historic interest and of untraditional forms, so I have no issues with their replacement in principle.”*

Dated 06.04.2022 Historic England stated

“Windows A,B, D, E & K We would not object to the replacement of these windows and alteration to form a more cohesive and traditional scheme reflective of the building, which we would consider a heritage benefit.”

#### **Window J**

The original application stated that the new window was to be placed in a clay lump wall, which was incorrect. It was asked that this was investigated and the wall has been demonstrated to be wattle and daub. Following this correction

Dated 12.08.2022 Thomas Pinner stated

*“Window J Having considered this further, it seems much more likely that the existing infill would be wattle and daub than clay lump. Furthermore, although the use of wattle and daub likely goes back beyond the C13, it is unlikely that wattle and daub from the earlier history of the building would still survive, and where it exists it is much more likely to be C18/C19. Given this, for the small amount to be removed, I consider that this would not amount to harm.”*

Dated 17.08.2022 Historic England Stated

*“Following this further information provided by the agent, I can confirm that Historic England have no objection to the scheme.*

- 1. Clay lump walls are by their nature thicker than this current wall as they require mass to stand up. It would also be incredibly rare to find clay lump between wooden studs due to the moisture content in the clay lump which would cause damp issues in the timber. We are therefore content that the wall would, in all probability be wattle and daub. Being a timber framed building, there will be other areas of this material across the building and the loss of a small part will not harm the significance of the building.”*