

**DESIGN, ACCESS HERITAGE STATEMENT
FOR
RE-INSTATEMENT OF ROOF STRUCTURE AND ROOF FINISH TO LOG STORE,
RE-BUILDING CHIMNEYS, CREATION OF RETAINING WALL TO REAR
AND FOR FIELD SHELTER IN FIELD
at
Villa Farmhouse, Main Road, Aust, South Glos.**

Prepared on behalf of
MR. D. SHEASBY

by

RICHARD PEDLAR ARCHITECTS

RPCA Limited, St Brandon's House
29 Great George Street
BS1 5QT
tel: 0117 9742612 Fax 0117 9737349 e mail info@rpca.co.uk

First Issue: 13.12.23

Our ref: SHS3335.DAHS04

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In June 2023 Andrew Thomas a Planning Enforcement Officer at South Glos. Planning Enforcement Team contacted the applicant regarding an investigation into works at Villa Farm (ref COM/23/0185/OD).

Subsequent to this there was an exchange of emails, a site visit and written advice as to the best way forward.

During the site visit the applicant summarised the existing planning and listed building consents, which had been sought to ensure correct approvals were in place, and described the great care which had been taken to carry out works in traditional materials and appropriate design to suit the historic building. The applicant explained how additional works came about and were carried out with the same care and attention to the heritage of the building.

Andrew Thomas reviewed the works and liaised with the Conservation team. The works were considered acceptable and it was suggested that further planning and listed building consent applications are made in order to regularise the position. This is set out in the email from Andrew Thomas, dated 10 July 2023, below:

I have discussed the matter with the conservation team and advise that, although the works did require planning permission, it is considered that they appear acceptable, and no further action will be taken at this time. Please note that this advice is given at officer level only and without prejudice to any formal determination that the Council may need to make. The nature of the works to the listed building is such that there is no immunity time limit for them and they will always represent a breach in the absence of a permission. For your own peace of mind, you may wish to apply for planning permission seeking to retain the works to the logstore roof and chimney.

The enquiry concerned several other points which I will address. Firstly, the retaining wall of the courtyard area behind the log store. I could find no extant permission for the wall. The plans for P19/12121/LB do appear to show something in this location but there are no accompanying elevations or annotations to indicate this as a wall. As such, I would advise that this too required planning permission. Having consulted with conservation it does appear that it would likely be acceptable though. We have also investigated a stables unit in the field to the Southeast of the dwelling. This stables unit also appears to be unauthorised development for which planning permission would have been required. My consideration is that the unit is of an acceptable size and suitable within the context of its location. Again, referring to the advice given previously, no further action will be taken at this time and this advice is given at officer level only and without prejudice to any formal determination that the Council may need to make. For your own peace of

mind, you may wish to apply for planning permission seeking to retain the wall and the stables.

Therefore a planning and listed building consent application has been prepared for the replacement of the log store roof (including the timber structure), replacement chimneys in brick, the retaining wall for the courtyard to the rear and the field shelter. This Statement is proportionate to the scope of the work and focuses on these areas alone.

2.0 DESCRIPTION AND ASSESSMENT OF THE HERIATGE ASSET

See the Statement of Significance by Planning Heritage Ltd July 2015 for an assessment of the heritage asset.

3.0 Description of Work, the Impact on the Heritage Asset and Justification

3.1 Log store roof

The timber structure and roof finish are replaced in traditional materials matching the original in size and design, but including a roofing membrane to provide extra protection to the structure.

The appearance is similar to the original form. Original roof tiles were re-used and any extras required were sourced from reclamation to match existing. The new roof gives the building a new lease of life. There is no harm to the significance of the listed building or the setting of the listed building.

Justified because the original timber structure had become rotten. See Photos on drawing SHS3335. 80-. Some roof tiles were broken.

3.2 Chimneys

Removal of cement render. In removing the cement render it was found that the masonry had disintegrated and the chimneys were structurally unsound and therefore dangerous. This necessitated rebuilding the chimneys in brick, using a heritage product to match existing. See photo on drawing SHS3335.82.

This returns the chimneys to their original appearance which had been negatively altered by the application of cement render at some point prior to the applicant purchasing the building. There is no harm to the significance of the listed building or the setting of the listed building.

Removal of the cement render was beneficial to the building in terms of appearance and preservation. The re-built chimneys in traditional form and materials gives a new lease of life.

3.3 *Courtyard Wall*

There is an existing planning approval and listed building consent for the creation of a courtyard to the rear of the house refs. P19/12121/LB and P19/12120/F, with a drain but not a retaining wall. The courtyard created differs in shape from the consented proposal although the area of courtyard is unchanged. The remaining ground beyond the courtyard was steeply sloping, requiring a retaining wall. This has been built with a rubble stone face (stone reclaimed on site from the approved removal of a stable block) to match the adjoining boundary wall and east elevation opposite. Lime mortar has been used and the wall finished with a stone coping. French drains are installed on both sides of retaining wall.

The sloping ground is not of great significance and the courtyard and retaining wall do not compromise the character and setting of the listed building. The style and scale of the changes are in keeping with the style and scale of the house. There is no harm to the significance of the listed building or its setting.

3.4 *Field Shelter*

The field shelter was installed in the field central to the farm as a mobile structure on skids for ease of re-location. It is constructed in timber and it does not have a foundations.

The structure is of a reasonable size, form and construction in relation to the rural context.

It is located some distance from the house so as not to impact the setting of the listed building.

In its use to shelter the animals on the farm, there is little requirement to move the shelter to different locations and, as such, the applicant seeks planning consent for the structure to remain in its current location.

4.0 Access

The new courtyard to the rear allows access to the kitchen which has stepped access within the house.

5.0 Conclusion

Each of the proposed changes has been carefully considered to be sympathetic to the heritage asset in style, form and materials. They preserve the building and its historic character for years to come.

The works have been assessed by the Enforcement Officer and Conservation Team and have been considered acceptable.