

england atp architecture town planning

4 strickland place, southwold, suffolk, ip18 6hn

**MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**Application DC/23/01457**

**Manor Cottage, Half Moon St. IP30 0RH**

Page | 1

**Additional Submission of Mitigating Circumstances . 18<sup>th</sup>  
May 2023.**

**Adding – Lowering roof levels - Dwg’s 4B & 4C- Elevation  
to Half Moon St. & Essential Context.**

### **Prologue**

‘Context is information that helps the message of a literary text make sense. Whether it's a novel, a memoir, or a collection of short stories, a piece of writing can be interpreted variably depending on the contextual factors you provide as the author’.

### **MITIGATING SUBMISSION .**

**Adding essential Context** into the comments being made by acting Mid Suffolk Heritage Officer and Rattlesden Parish Council - relating to our vernacular architecture we have deliberated to be exhibited along Half Moon St. Rattlesden.

**Paul England** : I am personally of ‘senior age’ still consulting professionally. Since training and since 1977 onwards I have been awarded – European Civic Trust Awards x 2 , North London Towns, and a City award for Conservation architecture x 3 and numerous other Awards in Hertfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Bedfordshire, and Suffolk .

My pinnacle was as appointment as project architect 1982-1989 at Broke Hall , Nacton, a Grade 2 star Mansion by James Wyatt in Repton landscape, Suffolk . This was a delicate extensive repairing conversion , landscaping, and infrastructure project to ‘create new life into a decaying historically important set of vast range of buildings’. It was a 7-year project of 23 conversions. I lived on part of the site within a converted stable with my family – up to and upon completion to eventually move to other parts of Suffolk - in 1997. I gained unbelievable experiences here

and to learn massive amounts of practicalities for repairing and administrating the 'sensitivities of such important historic buildings'.

### **Height or s73 amendment - Dwelling B Ridge Height.**

Both Thomas Pinner and Rattlesden Parish Council have made remarks- objections- regarding the adjusted height of the ridge to dwelling B. We consider that both are misjudging the 'vernacular architecture we display – in its setting upon undulating land - its form and scale of the architecture being exhibited.

In Thomas's case his judgement is probably made from a 'tabletop' position - as we must assume Thomas has not been to site - we are not sure about Rattlesden Parish council - but out of respect will assume they knew the 'lay of the land' well.

### **OBJECTIONS.**

#### **Rattlesden Parish Council .**

Consultee Details Name: Mr Andrew Scott Address: Whalebone Cottage, High Street, Rattlesden Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk IP30 0SB Email: Not Available

On Behalf Of: Rattlesden Parish Clerk Comments

Rattlesden Parish Council objects to this application. Councillors have found the drawings difficult to read and interpret, and the error in the original elevation for Dwelling B (now corrected) gave a misleading impression of the impact of the development on the conservation area, including grade II listed Manor Cottage. The proposed changes to accommodate a single vehicular access appear to the Council to lead to congested parking arrangements and a general feeling of overdevelopment on the site

**We had attended Rattlesden Parish Planning** meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> April 2023 with our client having given prior notice to their Clerk. A gentleman Chairman presided and 5 other men we assume councillors as no introductions or names were displayed and or given. Their Clerk sat in the meeting.

- Chairman said, 'Questions from the public'.
- Evidently - as I was reminded this was myself.
- I was asked why we had attended. *Ans- pay respects to their committee and explain why the s73 application was and why it is necessary and to answer questions. I gave a summary of*

*problems with third-party ownership of access land and my own erroneous drafting*

- I was told several times by one man the parking areas were tight. *Ans-I gave answer that it was designed to SCC standards and that SCCC Highways were making 'no adverse comments'.*
- The same man asked what would happen to this group of houses within 50 years. *A.I answered it was not a planning question and humorously said 'I am not a philosopher' , but the three houses could have their own title and could be bought and sold within the open market.*
- And finally, why had the height of dwelling B increased. *Ans. I admitted my error and gave reason why the collection of houses are all rising upward southwards along Half Moon Lane and should be adjudged within their group setting of scales and forms. We are confident we have achieved harmony.*
- *We were then thanked by the Chairman for attending and dismissed.*
- *Not welcomed to stay and listen to their deliberations.*

**Thomas Pinner** ; acting Heritage Officer. We do not know Thomas and have had no previous dealing with him. We do respect his authority in heritage matters.

Dear Averil,

DC/23/01457 03/05/2023 The current application seeks to vary Condition 2 (Approved Plans and Documents) of DC/22/03745 - for Change of Use and Extension to two buildings to form dwellings in order to vary the vehicular access and amend/correct the ridge height of part of Dwelling B. The Heritage Team did not provide comments on DC/22/03745, so I shall not consider the principle of the works here.

It appears that there were inconsistencies between the approved elevations as to the ridge height and roof form of the southern extension to Dwelling B. Consequently, the height of this extension was shown lower on the west and east elevations than on the south gable elevation. In principle, I consider that the taller this element is, the more likely it is to dominate/be intrusive within the setting of Manor Cottage (Grade II) as well as views out of and into the Conservation Area and the latter may also affect other heritage assets within the Conservation Area and thus cause more harm, particularly given the ground level changes. However, it is unclear what extension height has been approved.

The current application appears to seek to correct the approved drawings by consistently showing the height of this extension as reflecting that previously shown on the south gable elevation, now across all elevations. Therefore, the extension would remain no higher than has potentially already been approved. Nonetheless, particularly on the revised west elevation, the extension now appears higher than as shown on the south gable elevation, despite the measurements provided, and thus possibly the drawings are now inconsistent in the other direction (though it is difficult to accurately

measure from the drawings provided). I would therefore at least request that this is suitably addressed or clarified, so it is clear that the amended extension would not be higher than all previously approved drawings (unless the Local Planning Authority are satisfied that this is already the case). There also appears to be some design changes to the exterior of the new dwellings, alongside revisions to the access/driveway. Nonetheless, in the circumstances these are not considered to discernibly cause any additional harm.

Kind Regards,

Thomas Pinner BA(Hons), MA, MA Acting Senior Heritage Officer Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils M 07850 883264 T 01449 724819 E [thomas.pinner@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:thomas.pinner@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk) E [heritage@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:heritage@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk) W [www.babergh.gov.uk](http://www.babergh.gov.uk) [www.midsuffolk.gov.uk](http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk)

**To bring much-needed context** to his remarks particularly those underlined above regarding ‘principle of development’ & ‘the dominate – intrusive -height – harm to Conservation Area , caused by a singular ridge height upon dwelling B. They are questionable and we respectfully proceed on that basis. .

**The original Heritage Statement** is reintroduced and attached. The rationale for this it offers evidence and context of the ‘length and depth’ researching and the care given to the conception and end production of our submission.

**To demonstrate the care**, I had given to this design element to produce harmony into the elevation structure by producing ‘a line of general trajectory’ of the dominant rising highway Half Moon St. That trajectory runs through the mixed elevations of the submission documents and is demonstrated as varied ridge lines.

**This has now been qualified** by the production an analytical summery - attached Ref. -HM.TS.10 & 10A - of the spread of ridge heights of the five houses along Half Moon St. Rattlesden.

- They are a typical cacophony of buildings demonstrating true vernacular architecture.
- They are flanked by fairly boring new builds to West and East shown in imaginary B -D on HM.-TS.12 .

**The photography and imaginary A-E** shown within this additional submission , is to bring about the absolute context of the subject sites location and undulated setting within Half Moon St. and the Conservation Area of Rattlesden.

It intentionally demonstrates that the new buildings rear of Pegs Cottage and Amberfield to the immediate west of our application site having

much higher ridge levels. Sadly, our Topographical survey TS-10 did not include those. My 'experienced eye' has always adjudged a rise upwards of 1M-1.2M to those mixed houses ridges along Half Moon St.

### **Conclusion.**

I do not conclude that any harm can be placed upon the above mentioned 'new builds' as it is the mass, scale, material that is a paramount consideration in good vernacular architecture.

Page | 5

I similarly state No Harm is created by the architecture we have submitted; it offers harmony into the Conservation Area when compared to the remaining 'ad-hoc' displaced fire remains of Half Moon Inn – to those we have recreated a 'welcomed vernacular return' to its original forms in this submission.

### **Compromise.**

We have given the designs of the elevations a huge amount of considerations. Sketch plans were produced - analysed and a final decision being made, hence the submission that sadly has brought about objections – to which we have offered the explanations of mitigation above.

However, if we fail with this submission, we will offer two substitute elevations as a compromising choice for the objectors and MSDC to consider.

**Dwg 4B** – Offers a staggered 'staircase ridge' height that strictly follows the trajectory of the SCC Highway Half Moon St.  
This produces a finalised southern part Ridge height at 5.6 m

**Dwg. 4C** – This elevation encompasses both the original approved ridge height in 2022. The roof is now designed as a mansard roof form with a 150cm high container of green planting over the flat roof areas of Sedum Grass seeds. The planting will include at the edges where planting is meeting pantiles - trailing plants & grasses etc.  
This produces a finalised part Ridge height of 5.0M

england atp  
12<sup>th</sup> May 2023