



Design Strategy

Project: Proposed extension(s) and part
rebuild/rennovations and garage building
Address: 23/24 Park Cottages, Church Road Tattingstone
Client: Mr & Mrs W. Henley
Job Number: 488
Document Ref: 488-DS01

Background

23/24 Park Cottages, Church Road, Tattingstone are historic cottages and are grade II listed. The cottages are within single ownership with no. 24 in a significant state of disrepair. A structural engineers building condition survey has been commissioned by the applicants which has confirmed that repair to the existing structure (no. 24) is not feasible and that a proportion of rebuilding is required to bring the building back into functional use. The cottages are also adjoined but a further cottage to the East which is under separate ownership. The properties are built from soft red facing brick and are 1.5 storey high with no. 24 being smaller than the central cottage each with red clay plain tiled roofs. Access into each cottage is currently independent with no physical connection between the two properties. The properties have been extended to the rear with very dilapidated lean-to structures present to the rear of 24 and a 2 storey (1.5) extension to the rear of no. 23. A previous application was submitted and subsequently refused on the basis that the scale and amount of development proposed would cause harm on the listed building.

Brief

The premise of the design brief was to achieve a single family property that works as a single dwelling (despite its history being separate properties). The proposed design should provide 4 no. bedrooms.

Considerations

As noted above the property is 1.5 storey in height with no. 24 being some 1.2m lower than no. 23 and this element requires significant reconstruction.

This significant change in scale/form results in the physical access through to any addition (at first floor) being limited in terms of its position. This also potentially causes some very tricky abutment details. There are 3 no. theoretical connection points possible...

Option 1 – To the rear of 24

Access through into and extension in this position would be difficult with the already low roof present, in addition access through to no. 23 would result in needing to create an opening in the masonry wall between 23 & 24. This particular option also provides other difficulties due to the disparate nature of the roof lines and any extension would need to be solely to the rear of no. 24 and NOT straddle the two properties. The physical scale would also be limited to this option given that no. 24 has a low ridge line when compared with no. 23.

Option 2 – To the rear of the extension to no. 23

This option was previously considered and utilized for the previous (refused) planning application and to meet the brief any extension would need to add substantial mass and the previously refused application considered that an extension in this area would not be acceptable and would be overbearing for the neighbouring properties.

Option 3 – To the side of the rear extension to no. 23

This option has been considered in detail. This option creates a distinctly awkward set of details where the proposed first floor extends to the West. There would be a requirement for a ground floor in the gap created however, this narrow space would cause both maintenance issues and awkward details/spaces.

The existing cottage(s) utilize a simple palette of materials with soft red facing bricks being the dominant material used on the walls with the roofs of the existing cottages finished in red clay pantiles. The proposals seek to compliment these materials with further use albeit with less articulate detailing and simple moderns forms with proportions to match those of the existing.

Summary

As a result of the above analysis, it is clear that there is no 'obvious' solution to achieve the solution however, the option that has the least amount impact on the historic fabric whilst providing a harmonious connection between old and new option 1 provides the best solution as long as the first floor connection and extent of walls etc is located solely behind plot 24.

As noted in the prior option analysis the first floor circulation is a primary consideration as there is no way to physically link the two cottages without creating a new link between the two structures. Whilst it is theoretically possible to retain the two structures independently by repairing/replacing the existing dilapidated staircase to no. 24 this would sever any potential first floor link between the two properties and extinguish the design brief resulting in the first floor being split into two. As such the proposed design proposes that the dilapidated staircase is removed with a first floor link between the two properties and whilst the staircase is to be removed, the stairwell opening is proposed to be retained with balustrading to be built around the retained opening.

The proposed and submitted extension utilises a very similar palette of materials replicating the soft red facing brick with very similar proportions and detailing with the use of parapet gables. The single storey elements are distinctly subservient with modern parapet detailing and natural vertical timber cladding.

The proposed rear extension(s) are distinctly modern with their detailing ensuring that a distinct juxtaposition is created between old and new to ensure that the extended elements do not try to 'complete' with the articulate detailing of the existing cottage(s) to remain and proportions to match those of the existing.