

Joyce Christie

From: Joyce Christie
Sent: 18 March 2022 13:51
To: Sarah Greenall
Subject: 22/00336/F 1 Meadow Crest Cottages Burdrop resubmission of 21/00565/F

Hi Sarah

I will upload on DEF

- Setting of listed building
- Sibford Gower and Burdrop Conservation Area



1 Meadow Crest Cottages:

Mid-terrace thatched ironstone cottage in the centre of Burdrop which forms part of the Sibford Gower and Burdrop Conservation Area.

1-3 Meadow Cottages are collectively a non-designated heritage asset, their principal elevations face east onto the village lane. It adjoins the Grade II listed Goodmays, which in turn adjoins the Grade II listed Burdrop Cottage (left when looking at the principal elevation facing the street). The proposals should be assessed in light of Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets (GPA3).

A public right of way runs to the east of Meadow Cottages.

Planning history:

13/01306/F: was not registered but the application was for a lean-to glazed conservatory set between stone walls, allowing some transparency towards the rear wall of the cottage.

20/03364/PREAPP: Conservation were not consulted but this was for a 2-storey double gabled extension with 2 No rooflights to the front slope of the principal thatched roof. The gable nearest Goodmays was partially stepped back.

21/00565/F: withdrawn. Conservation were consulted.

This was very similar to the earlier 20/03364/PREAPP. 2-storey rear extension, 2 large rooflights on the front thatched roof and porch canopy.

Current Proposal 22/00336/F:

The cottage is currently not extended and the rear elevation can be clearly read.



The boundary between No 1 Meadow Cottages and Goodmays is interesting as it shows the small rear extension seen on historic OS maps was a lean-to which predates the enlarged flat roofed/low pitched single-storey extension at Goodmays (see

photo below). The 1875-87 OS map shows Nos 2 and 3 as linear buildings with no rear extensions and this form continued up to the 1971-4 OS map (please note the cottages were once divided into smaller cottages). The plot sheet shows an application for 2 and 3 Meadow Cottages 491/81 (Proposed extensions, modernisations and improvements to three cottages together with two garages – conditions included the external walls of the proposed two-storey extensions...'). Application 680/81 relates to an extension to cottage at Goodmays.



1875-87 OS Map and the boundary wall with Goodmays showing the scar of the former small single-storey lean-to. The wall to the extension at Goodmays has increased the height of the boundary wall.



Nos 2 and 3 each have a rear gable extension with pitched roofs dating from 1981. The southern wall of the extension at No 2 forms the boundary between Nos 1 and 2.

The earlier application 13/01306/F for a lean-to glazed extension spanning almost the entire width of the rear elevation, was of a similar form but on a longer and deeper footprint than the historic lean-to. The amount of glazing proposed would have allowed the rear elevation of the property to remain visible, albeit behind reflective glass by day, but by night when artificially illuminated, the extension would have been quite dominant in the setting of the adjacent listed building and the non-designated heritage assets. The glazed roof would also have allowed light to spill out which could have impacted on the dark rural village.

This application is for a single storey flat-roofed extension, built across almost the full width of the rear elevation, with a heavy fascia to the eaves and a large glazed screen below within a 'goal-post' of masonry. The current elevations do not show the 4No large planar rooflights that are shown on the roof plan. The west elevation of the proposed extension would align with the 1.5 storey gabled extension at No 2.

The current design would make a greater impact than the unregistered 2013 scheme as it is heavier and obscures more of the rear elevation. It is possible that the fascia could be quite dominant in southerly views of the rear elevation from the Conservation Area. The proposed extension would cause some harm to the non-designated heritage asset. There would also be some harm to the Conservation Area and the setting of Goodmays, which would be greater if the extension was approved with the heavy fascia seen on the drawings.



Goodmays has been partly compromised by the 1981 extension approved prior to its listing in 1988 (I assume this heightened the lean-to boundary wall, and is of flat roofed/low-pitched form - the microfiche may hold more information). I would not

object to a simple single-storey lean-to extension based on historic precedent if it could abut the party wall and not cause issues with the adjacent listed property. I would prefer that the did not cover the entire ground floor of the non-designated heritage asset. This could be a traditional structure but a slate roof would reduce the depth due to the required roof pitch. Alternatively it could be a modern interpretation of a lean-to, such as lightweight glass structure with a solid roof which terminates in a thin eaves. This would allow greater transparency to the rear wall of the house and reduce its impact. Omitting the 4 proposed rooflights would reduce light spill in this typically dark village. The example below shows a solid roof stopping short of the historic wall with a glazed margin allowing views of the whole wall whilst allowing natural light to be borrowed by the original rear ground floor windows. A single rooflight may be an acceptable alternative.



Examples of a margin of glass beside a historic wall and thinner eaves which project beyond the glass and providing some shading, overheating can be an issue in glazed conservatories.

Thatched canopy:

Whilst there is a precedent for a thatched canopy on the terrace, I have reviewed the proposal to add a new thatched canopy to the door of No1 and consider this would be difficult to detail as there is not enough wall between the door and the neighbour at No 2. This element would be impracticable and should be omitted from any application.



Tree:

I note there is a large tree in the rear garden of 1 Meadow Crest Cottages – have you consulted our tree people as any foundations could affect the tree and if the tree were to die it could affect the adjacent listed building and list outbuildings as the roots would die back and the water table would change?

Maintenance:

The photos below show there is a rainwater issue at the junction between the 2-storey extension at No 2 and 1 Meadow Crest Cottages, as the wall is stained beside the hopper at the base of the lead flashing at the abutment. This may be simply down to not regularly clearing the hopper. There is no visible flashing at the junction between the thatch and the slate roof of the extension at No 2 and it is likely water is discharging onto the thatch of both Nos 1 and 2 Meadow Crest Cottages, with the majority of rainwater collected in the gutter that discharges to a RWP on the gable of the extension. Recommend the hopper is regularly cleared out and the situation reviewed with regard to the staining.



Recommendation:

I would not support the extension in its current form. A single storey extension could be acceptable subject to design and detailing – see comments above. The thatched door canopy is impracticable and should be dropped.

Harm:

Less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed buildings, the Conservation Area and the non-designated heritage assets.

Joyce Christie 18.02.2022