

Teresa Turner

From: James Bate
Sent: 09 September 2019 11:25
To: Teresa Turner
Subject: RE: DMPA/2019/0878

Teresa,

I understand that this site has some extensive history. The two storey extension which stands partially implemented was granted planning permission in late 1991, the extension was never completed and the property has been vacant ever since.

New owners have identified flood risk on the site which affect both the original building and the partly completed extension.

Typically extensions should seek not to dominate the existing building however in this case it is not possible to raise floor levels within the standing building owing to already limited ceiling heights and it is not considered to be desirable to simply demolish the existing structure and build a replacement dwelling with the existing property identified as a positive building within the Barrow on Trent conservation area, being prominent from an adjacent public right of way and being of some notable age, being shown on the 1879 1st Series OS mapping.

As such it has been proposed that the existing partly completed extensions be demolished and a new extension designed which would lift internal floorspace above the level of floor risk (c. 600mm above the existing floor levels). The result of this is that the proposed extensions are necessarily taller than the existing property and would be partly visible over the ridge of its roof from the public vantage points to the west. A number of 3D visualisations have been included within the design and access statement and these help to illustrate that the visibility of the upper gable of the proposed extension will not be so striking as the elevation drawings initially suggest.

A significant portion of the existing buildings ground floor would be given over to storage and utility spaces with the main habitable rooms (kitchen, dining room, lounge) in the new build extension at the rear. I accept the statement in the supporting statement that the rear of the original building is in generally poor condition, it is also largely hidden from the public realm - although it may be visible in glimpses from a more distant public right of way which runs roughly north-south 130 metres to the east, but then only in deep winter when the significant tree cover is not in leaf.

It is considered that the proposals deficiencies in terms of the subservience of the proposed extensions arise from site specific constraints and that these have been addressed via design insofar as it is possible to address them both by physically subdividing the massing of the proposed extensions and using materials to soften the impacts of a raised finished floor level through the creation of a contrasting stone plinth, which is itself an occasional feature of the local vernacular in any event. The proposal also avoids impacts on the most publically visible elevations of the historic portion of the property, maintaining the positive contribution which it makes to the special architectural and historic character and appearance of the conservation area. The extensions address an issue of flood risk affecting the property and allow it to be brought back into use as a dwelling, justifying maintenance of both the buildings and the wider site which should also have positive implications for the special architectural and historic character and appearance of the conservation area.

As such I would be satisfied that overall the proposal will be beneficial to the special architectural and historic character and appearance of the conservation area and would achieve the desirable objective described in section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

I would suggest conditions requiring details of facing and roofing materials (including render colour and the stonework for the plinth of the proposed extension).

Yours,

James Bate

Conservation Officer

T: 01283 595983

www.southderbyshire.gov.uk



People | Place | Progress

www.southderbyshire.gov.uk



**South
Derbyshire**
District Council

Any advice is given at officer level only and does not prejudice any formal decision the Council makes in the future.