

CONNOR FERRIS ARCHITECTS

✉ Connor@connorferrisarchitects.co.uk

☎ +44(0)7479691162

🌐 www.connorferrisarchitects.co.uk

30.11.2023

Mr Connor Smith BArch(Hons) MArch(Hons) PgDip ARB RIBA

Connor Ferris Architects
The Studio, Daines,
Church Lane,
Chelmsford,
Essex,
CM1 1SU

Connor@connorferrisarchitects.co.uk

Re: USE OF PRE APP REPORT TO MILLFIELD HOUSE, MILLFIELD, BARNSTON, CM6 1LH.

Application No: UTT/23/0171/PA

PREAPP Description: Single Storey Rear Extension

Location: Millfield House, Millfield, Barnston, CM6 1LH.

To whom it may concern, please see below the heritage statement, for the construction of a single storey rear extension, an additional 1.5m to the existing old rear extension to Millfield House, Barnston.

Amended design post application UTT/23/1390/LB and Pre-Application Meeting.

The design has been amended after a refusal in the initial application UTT/23/1390/LB. Following comments from heritage that expressed some concern in certain aspects of the design. We have been in contact with the heritage officer since, and amended the design to gain a more acceptable design. The new design, implements a new additional balancing window on the north-east elevation. All rooflights have been omitted, and the width of the extension has decreased to not impact the existing building. The senior built heritage consultant, namely Caroline Sones, has since expressed that in balance she would now support the application.

Description of Site

The application site is located within the development limits of Barnston. The dwelling is a Grade II listed building with substantial additions. The original building dates from the 17th century or earlier and is of an oak framed structure with jowled storage posts and stop chamfered beams, with rendered facades and a thatched roof with dormers. There is an existing 20th century two storey extension to the south western end and a further single storey extensions to the north eastern end and north western side.

The dwelling is located within a large plot with open fields to the north. There are residential properties to three sides

Site Constraints

Within Development Limits (BARNSTON)

Listed Building - Grade II - Reference: 1166324 (Millfield House, Mill Field, Barnston, Great Dunmow, Dunmow, Essex, CM6 1LH)

Archaeological Site - Site Number: 1317

Within 2km of S.S.S.I

Mineral Safeguarding Area - Sand/Gravel

Design

THANK YOU FOR YOUR BUSINESS!

Connor Ferris Architects
07479 691162

✉ Connor@connorferrisarchitects.co.uk

CONNOR FERRIS ARCHITECTS

✉ Connor@connorferrisarchitects.co.uk

☎ +44(0)7479691162

🌐 www.connorferrisarchitects.co.uk

The NPPF stipulates development should respond to the local character, reflect the identity of its surroundings, optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development and is visually attractive because of good architecture (NPPF, paragraph 134).

Policy GEN2 of the Local Plan seeks, amongst other things, that any development should be compatible with the surrounding area in terms of scale, form layout and appearance of surrounding buildings, reduce crime, energy reduction and protects the environment and amenity. As part of any application, the proposal would need to demonstrate that there would not be any harm to the amenities enjoyed by neighbours in relation to loss of light or overlooking and not be visually intrusive.

Development will not be permitted if it would have a materially adverse effect on the reasonable occupation and enjoyment of a residential or other sensitive property, as a result of loss of privacy, loss of daylight, overbearing impact or overshadowing.

Under previous application (UTT/20/3334/HHF & UTT/20/3335/LB) it was refused by virtue of its scale, form and design. It has been noted that the proposal has been reduced in order to satisfy Heritage and not to obscure as much of the historic fabric to the rear of the dwelling. The addition of a reduced depth single storey element to the building is of a scale, of good design that respects the host dwelling and is considered to be in keeping with the locality. Providing the use of high-quality materials are used, it is considered to be something that you would expect to see in a development of this type.

Connor Ferris Architects comments: *Above it has been agreed and noted that the new proposal has been reduced in scale, form and design, to satisfy heritage. The new design, has taken away the 'ultra-modern' bifold door and timber/metal cladding, and has kept to a more traditional in keeping render finish to match the existing building, whilst also reducing the depth of the extension.*

Ecology

ULP Policy GEN7 of the Local Plan states that development that would have a harmful effect on wildlife will not be permitted unless the need for the development outweighs the importance of the feature of nature conservation. Where the site includes protected species, measures to mitigate and/or compensate for the potential impacts of development must be secured.

Under your previous application (UTT/20/3334/HHF) Ecology placed a holding objection due to insufficient ecological information on European Protected Species (Bats). If a forthcoming application was submitted to the Local Planning Authority, it is recommended that a bat Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) should be undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist and submitted along with the application in support of your proposal.

Connor Ferris Architects comments: *A bat survey, has been completed and attached to the planning application, all details can be found without this professional report, as it does conclude no evidence of bats.*

Environmental Health

No Environmental Health concerns were raised on site and as such there is no requirement to consult them on this proposal. As the proposal concerns a small extension to the rear of the dwelling, however the LPA does reserve the right to attach a condition stipulating that if contamination on the site is found during works, that the Local Planning Authority is informed, and works are stopped until a time that remedial works are confirmed in writing with the LPA.

Connor Ferris Architects comments: *No comments on environmental health required.*

Heritage

THANK YOU FOR YOUR BUSINESS!

Connor Ferris Architects
07479 691162

✉ Connor@connorferrisarchitects.co.uk

CONNOR FERRIS

ARCHITECTS

✉ Connor@connorferrisarchitects.co.uk

☎ +44(0)7479691162

🌐 www.connorferrisarchitects.co.uk

As part of the Heritage Pre-Application Advice, Place Services Heritage Environment Team have been consulted on the proposals:

“Millfield House is a Grade II listed timber framed, plastered and thatched cottage of a single storey with attic (List entry: 1166324) which has been dated to the seventeenth century or earlier. It has three extensions: to the north and west (both single storey) and to the south (two storey), two of which pre-date its listing in 1984 (the list entry notes ‘attached C20 extensions to left and right’). The two storey extension is likely to be the ‘addition of sitting room, playroom, two bedrooms, playroom etc’ approved in 1970. There is also a large detached annexe (of one storey plus attic) to the north west of the listed building (which may be the ‘new garage with store room over’ approved in 1977), a swimming pool with associated shed and hard landscaping to the front (west side) of the house, and a garden to the rear (north and east) which overlooks open farmland to the north. The listed building has thus undergone considerable modern development which has quite overwhelmed the historic core and is unsympathetic in terms of the scale, design, materials and detailing.

The current pre-application follows a previous pre-application in December 2019 and a full application for a single storey rear extension which was refused in June 2021 (UTT/20/3334/HHF and UTT/20/3335/LB). Advice on the pre-application and a consultation response on the submitted application were provided by this office. The submitted application was not supported on the basis that it sought to extend the existing extension to the north of the property by 3.3 metres which would result in ‘an unsympathetic addition and creates a sprawling footprint, detracting from the architectural quality of the listed property’. The consultation response also noted: At pre-application it was noted that the demolition and replacement of the existing extension with a slight increase in footprint was acceptable in principle as it remained subservient. The proposed extension would be more than half the footprint of the seventeenth century core and therefore, neither subservient nor respectful to the significance of the property.

The current pre-application proposal is to retain and extend the existing single storey extension to the north which, although not of the highest quality in terms of materials and detailing is arguably the most sympathetic of the three existing extensions in terms of its footprint, scale, massing and traditional design including fenestration. It is duly subservient to the thatched cottage, particularly when viewed from the south and east. The valley roof form aimed to retain (albeit not entirely successfully) visibility of the gable end of the thatched cottage and its first floor window.

In line with previous advice, due to the extent to which the listed building has been previously extended and overwhelmed by modern additions, I would be able to support only a small increase in the footprint of the existing extension - in my opinion, the suggested 2.2 metres would be the absolute limit of additional development - and no increase in height. Retaining the subservience of this extension to the historic core of the building is key and it should continue to respect the gable end of the listed building and sit cleanly below the height of the first floor window cills on both the north and east elevations. In my view, due to the large quantum of existing modern additions on site which pay scant regard to the special historic and architectural interest of the host building, a design which favours a traditional roof form, fenestration and materials (timber windows and doors, natural slate roofing, a red brick plinth and rendered walls), would be far more sympathetic than another addition to a contemporary design. I would not, therefore, support a glazed gable or bifold doors in this sensitive context, and consider that traditional doors and windows should be able to provide sufficient glazing to deliver the desired views to the north.

Any forthcoming application should be accompanied by a heritage statement which meets the requirements set out in Paragraph 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021): In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning

THANK YOU FOR YOUR BUSINESS!

Connor Ferris Architects
07479 691162

✉ Connor@connorferrisarchitects.co.uk

CONNOR FERRIS ARCHITECTS

✉ Connor@connorferrisarchitects.co.uk

☎ +44(0)7479691162

🌐 www.connorferrisarchitects.co.uk

authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.”

Connor Ferris Architects comments: *No comments on environmental health required.*

- *The submitted application was not supported on the basis that it sought to extend the existing extension to the north of the property by 3.3 metres which would result in ‘an unsympathetic addition and creates a sprawling footprint, detracting from the architectural quality of the listed property’ It was noted that the previous application was too large in scale, and this revised application has significantly reduced this scale.*
- *(timber windows and doors, natural slate roofing, a red brick plinth and rendered walls)* These three materials, suggested have been noted, and now have been placed on the design only. Meeting heritage / councils requests.
- *I would not, therefore, support a glazed gable or bifold doors in this sensitive context, and consider that traditional doors and windows should be able to provide sufficient glazing to deliver the desired views to the north.* The original pre app meeting design, included a glazed gable and bi-fold doors, since the application report had been received, we have amended the design to suit comments. The glazed gable has now been removed, replacing it with a more sympathetic window, matching in existing elevations, also bi-fold doors have been removed and replaced with more sensitive double traditional French doors still allowing for the views to the north.
- *Any forthcoming application should be accompanied by a heritage statement which meets the requirements set out in Paragraph 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021)* The planning application has an attached heritage statement.

Conclusion

It is considered that the addition of a small single storey rear extension is acceptable and can be supported by the Local Planning Authority subject to Heritage’s concerns being addressed.

I would advise that additional justification is submitted along with any forthcoming application in support of the proposed extension, I would also advise that if any of the concerns that Heritage have raised in their consultation response can be addressed prior to any further submission would help strengthen your case for a grant of permission.

If a planning application was forthcoming, the Local Planning Authority would be able to support this proposal subject to statutory consultees input and approval.

Connor Ferris Architects comments: *Overall, we would recommend the application should be approved, as we have made all the changes that were discussed on site at the Pre-app meeting, and mentioned in the above report. Glazed windows and bi-fold doors have been removed, the scale of the extension is smaller than the original refused application, and the materials specified are those recommended in this report.*

Kind Regards,

Connor Smith BArch(Hons) MArch(Hons) PgDip ARB RIBA
Architect & Proprietor


The Studio, Daines,
Church Lane, Chelmsford,
Essex, CM1 7SF.


THANK YOU FOR YOUR BUSINESS!

Connor Ferris Architects
07479 691162

✉ Connor@connorferrisarchitects.co.uk

CONNOR FERRIS ARCHITECTS

 Connor@connorferrisarchitects.co.uk


 +44(0)7479691162

 www.connorferrisarchitects.co.uk

CONNOR FERRIS ARCHITECTS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR BUSINESS!

Connor Ferris Architects
07479 691162

 Connor@connorferrisarchitects.co.uk
