Application to mitigate & regularise existing works

Lapford Mill group improvements : Planning Reference: PP-11662063
Prepared by Alex Gater, Applicant Owner, November 2022
References: Historic England list entries 1425004 & 1425005;
Listings Officer J. Nixon comments;
Enforcement Officer S. Jenkins comments

Retrospective Application with Design & Access Statements in [redacted]

To regularise three distinct existing structures and approval for applying mitigations proposed, being;

1. Logstore - PP & LBC sought. No mitigation proposed
2. Staircase - PP & LBC sought with mitigating improvement
3. Timber Link Annex - PP & LBC sought with consideration of proposed mitigations

1. Logstore and raised decked landing

Comments from listings officer;

- Planning Permission and LBC is required.
- No objection to its form and finish

Permission is here sought to adopt this structure (*Photo: 1-Timber Logstore*)

Design & Access Statement

The landing area is constructed in accordance to requirements set out in HM Gov't Building Regulations 2010, Requirement K2 Protection from falling. 10mm toughened glass with polished edges meeting BSEN12150 affixed using stainless steel 316 Grade brackets suitable for external use.

2. Staircase to mill 1st floor

Comments from listings officer;

- General design and use of timber is supported for the staircase
- Existing brown painted finish and poor junction with the FF landing decked outside the access doors is not of the quality required.

Mitigations suggested;

- The colour of the staircase/finish is changed to take reference from the mill.
- Recommend the junction of stairs to landing is adjusted by a carpenter to appear more integrated with the decked landing, rather than its present disjointed appearance

The existing stain colour of the staircase was intended to blend in to the brickwork and stone of the mill and took several attempts to get close. Comment from listings officer is that present colour appears somewhat discordant in-situ and it was discussed painting it black to refer to the door and wheel shrouds would improve the look of the case and its junction to the logstore deck.
Having also made enquiries with a competent builder / carpenter I confirm that, structurally speaking, the junction is soundly fixed with corrosion-proof coach bolts.

Permission is therefore sought to regularise the staircase by overpainting in black, referring to mill doors and waterwheel shrouds.
A separate forthcoming application will seek to address the existing plastic hopper and downpipes adjacent as this is not plumbed to a foul sewer. Options for improving and or removing this element are currently being reviewed for proposal in a separate application, and to address comments made by the listings officer.

Design & Access Statement

Structural detail : Ind Rise 217mm, Ind Tread 242mm, Width 850mm, Angle 41.8^{o}
The staircase is constructed in accordance to requirements set out in HM Gov't Building Regulations 2010, Requirement K1 Stairs, ladders and ramps and Requirement K2 Protection from falling. 10mm toughened glass with polished edges meeting BSEN12150 affixed using stainless steel 316 Grade brackets suitable for external use.

(*Photo: 2-Staircase and Logstore*)

3. Replacement Timber Link Annex between Lapford Mill House (main house) and Millstream Cottage

Comments from listings officer;

- a) Colour : Listings officer comment was to prefer a very dark brown or black, "*as would be common in the setting of listed building.*"
- b) Roof : Listings officer comment was to prefer a steeper pitch to the roof, that "*it appears rather strange set against the rear parapet wall, when viewed from the courtyard."*

Background
The main house (C14th) was extended in 1971 , adding a two storey extension housing the kitchen, utility room, lavatory and a further upstairs bedroom with en-suite. A timber-glass 'link' structure was a later addition believed circa 1980s/90s between the house kitchen and C19th converted cottage.

The present structure (referred to as 'timber link annex') is a like-for-like replacement constructed in 2020. The previous structure was timber / glass but very badly executed and literally collapsed due to rotten beams and water ingress in late 2019. The initial intention to repair was not viable so this like-for-like replacement was erected early 2020. The intention was to keep to the same materials and design so not to alter the shape, size, layout and general appearance.

a) Colour
As the previous structure was light in colour it was not my preference to stain this darker or attempt to make it somehow appear older than it is. I would be concerned that a black stain on the modern timbers would have a *mock-tudor* look and would be a significant diversion from the previous lighter wooden structure. The existing orange/yellow timber look changes as it ages, to a darker soft warm silver-grey. This process has started and is evident in parts, however it has further to go and I would expect it to give up it's orange/yellow look completely over the next few years.

My experience in trying to stain the mill staircase (*reference 2, above*) to match the building is that different timber responds very differently to stain pigments and the

finished colour can vary widely from the label.

With the diverse history of this group spanning several centuries, I would much prefer to allow the existing timbers to age naturally, at east for a couple of years and take a view then. I am not keen to do anything now that might appear an attempt to superficially 'age' the structure in preference for retaining the historic 'legibility' across the group. Given my concerns and previous disappointment in using stains, after much consideration and discussion with a professional, my preference would now be to allow the timbers of the annex to mature fully and weather naturally revealing their final 'look' before seeking to apply any enhancement prematurely.
(Photo: 3-Timber Link Annex)

b) Mono-pitch Roof shallow angle
The current roof pitch and size are identical to the previous building however is was suggested by the listings officer that an 'enhancement' could have been applied when replacing this structure by increasing the roof pitch.

Having now consulted a professional builder, it was pointed out to me that the previous, rather shallow mono-pitch of the roof would have been necessary in order to join beneath the projection of the flat roof above the kitchen and accommodating rain goods. In heavy weather, a significant amount of run-off from the large flat kitchen roof is conducted there.

I am still awaiting a written quote / report from my builder, which I will forward when I have it. His, advice is that increasing the pitch would also necessitate significant reengineering of the kitchen flat roof to either conduct rain run-off towards the rear of the house, or rebuild with rain gullies. Increasing the pitch would further reduce the available gap for run-off from flat roof to annex and in turn would also require changes to the kitchen flat roof as run-off from the large flat area would likely overpower current rain goods, which only just cope at present during heavier weather.

(-Also of concern is that we recently (this summer) suffered a ground floor flood through the house due to an exceptionally heavy bout of rain and hale, overpowering the surface drain at the rear of the house. Although it was the hale washed in from the main road that blocked the drain, I feel any changes to the roofs here need careful consideration in conjunction with the drains and their capacities.)

A second option considered was to leave the rear of the annex at its present height and reduce the height of the front, however this would also be a significant deviation from the previous structure. Furthermore, it would not be possible to lower the frontage by more than 2 inches as would interfere with the kitchen window as the annex roof would be lower than the opening window.

Given all the above, I would ask to be taken in to consideration that this annex does not change the look, size , materials or construction of the previous structure and although improvements could one day be sought across both roof structures, I would today seek to regularise the existing structure as is, postponing possible improvements together with the house kitchen roof for a future date.

The structure is a like-for-like replacement of a preexisting structure circa 1980-1990 and is a Class 7 category building under Schedule 2 of The Building Regulations 2010 and

materials comply with The Regulations.

(*Photo: 4-Annex Roof Pitch*)
(*Photo: 5-Annex to Cottage*)
(*Photo: 6-Annex to Flat Roof detail*)
(*Photo: 7-Annex to Flat Roof*)

[END]