

From: Alex [<mailto:Alex@hookmason.co.uk>]

Sent: 11 June 2015 09:55

To: Reed, Emily

Cc:

Subject: RE: 150919 & 150920 - Gardeners Cottage, Walford, Ross-on-Wye, Herefordshire, HR9 5QN.

Dear Emily,

Thank you for considering an extension of time in this case and I attach a revised drawing 2055-31-3B showing a revised scheme including 2no. roof lights to the east kitchen roof as discussed with Janet Poole. I have also altered the note relating to the folding sliding doors that their detail is to be confirmed via a condition.

I hope that the above meets with your approval and if so, I would be grateful if the attached drawing could supersede 2055-31-3 enclosed with the application.

Kind Regards

Alex

Alex Whibley MCIAT

Associate

for and on behalf of

Hook Mason Limited



hookmasonarchitecture

Hereford: 01432 352299

Gloucester: 01452 899550

Haverfordwest: 01437 206215

e: alex@hookmason.co.uk

w: www.hookmason.co.uk

From: Reed, Emily [<mailto:Emily.Reed@herefordshire.gov.uk>]

Sent: 26 May 2015 08:04

To: Alex

Subject: RE: 150919 & 150920 - Gardeners Cottage, Walford, Ross-on-Wye, Herefordshire, HR9 5QN.

Dear Alex,

Thank you for your email.

Yes I agree to an extension. I look forward to hearing from you regarding if/when amended plans would be received later this week.

Kind regards,

Emily

From: Alex [<mailto:Alex@hookmason.co.uk>]

Sent: 22 May 2015 15:42

To: Reed, Emily

Cc:

Subject: RE: 150919 & 150920 - Gardeners Cottage, Walford, Ross-on-Wye, Herefordshire, HR9 5QN.

Dear Emily,

Further to my telephone message we haven't been given much time to get an answer to you before your quoted deadline. The final decision will need to be agreed by the board the family members who own the business and it is proposed that this will be discussed next week.

I note that the planning determination date has passed and in light of the above can we please have an extension in order to get back to you on Janet's queries.

Kind Regards

Alex

Alex Whibley MCIAT

Associate

for and on behalf of

Hook Mason Limited



hookmasonarchitecture

Hereford: 01432 352299

Gloucester: 01452 899550

Haverfordwest: 01437 206215

e: alex@hookmason.co.uk

w: www.hookmason.co.uk

From: Reed, Emily [<mailto:Emily.Reed@herefordshire.gov.uk>]

Sent: 18 May 2015 17:11

To: Alex

Subject: 150919 & 150920 - Gardeners Cottage, Walford, Ross-on-Wye, Herefordshire, HR9 5QN.

Dear Mr Whibley,

150919 & 150920 - Gardeners Cottage, Walford, Ross-on-Wye, Herefordshire, HR9 5QN.

I write with regard to the above planning and listed building applications.

The consultation period has now closed and there have been no objections from the public or the Parish Council. However, I have received the following from the Council's Historic Buildings Officer:

Garden Cottage is one of the estate buildings associated with Hillcourt. Hillcourt is grade I listed and is a substantial country house, constructed between 1698 and 1700. There are a number of other individually listed buildings and structures within the grounds and the gardens are on the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens for their special historic interest (grade II). The walled garden where Garden Cottage is located lies to the south of the house and is contemporary with the house. The walled garden is now laid out as a flower garden and the head gardener's cottage which is the subject of this application stands in the south-west corner of the garden.

Garden Cottage is not listed individually but it is regarded as listed because it is within the curtilage of Hillcourt and clearly has a functional relationship with the principal building.

The proposal includes the demolition of the existing porch, a small lean-to store, and the larger store / workshop to the south elevation. The existing porch and lean-to store have little architectural or historic merit. The larger, pitched roof store has more interest because of its functional relationship with the cottage but again it does not have significant architectural value and the principle of replacing it with an extension of a similar form is not opposed.

While the principle of the single storey extension is considered to be acceptable, there are some aspects of the design that need to be amended. The single storey extension following a more traditional design is compromised by the glazing system proposed to be inserted within the roof slope. This glazing dominates the roof slope of the extension and detracts from the more delicate but intricate detail of the original building. Since there will be glazing across the flat roofed element to the east elevation and a new window in the south elevation, there does not seem to be any justification for the glazing in the roof and it should be removed from the scheme. The contemporary flat roofed element is felt to be acceptable since it is relatively modest and discreet; however, the use of white uPVC for the folding sliding doors is not supported. It is suggested that these are either timber or good quality aluminium frames.

The existing two storey bay at the southern end of the cottage is not as originally built, although the historic maps indicate that the footprint of the cottage covered a similar area compared to today. Possibly it was previously a single storey element (the newer brickwork is at first floor level) linking with the store. The proposal to enlarge this part of the building by extending it to the front is in keeping with the architecture of the rest of the cottage. Subject to the materials and detail being agreed, this is considered to be acceptable.

Although the porch is over the French doors leading into the sitting room, the doorway to the southern side of the east elevation appears to have served as the main day to day entrance into the cottage for some time. Because the garden wall joins the cottage and therefore splits it externally, it is not possible to easily gain access to the entrance where the porch is currently located. Relocating the porch over the other door would therefore be rational and would not compromise the way the cottage functioned historically or its architectural interest.

It is concluded that the principle of extending the cottage is acceptable; however, the roof lights to the single storey extension and the uPVC sliding doors to the contemporary addition compromise the architectural interest of the building contrary to Policy HBA1 and would have a harmful impact on the setting of the Registered Park and Garden contrary to Policy LA4. The roof lights should be omitted and alternative materials proposed for the sliding doors as suggested above.

If the above issues can be resolved, conditions would be needed relating to the window and door details; roof details i.e. bargeboards etc; details of the rainwater goods; and a sample of brick and slate.

Given the above, amendments are required. If your client finds these to be acceptable, I look forward to receiving amended plans by Tuesday 26th May 2015.

Kind regards,

Emily Reed, Planning Officer

Herefordshire Council | Blueschool House, Blueschool Street | Hereford | HR1 2ZB

Tel: 01432 383894 | Email: emily.reed@herefordshire.gov.uk