

Mr Matthew Neilson Direct Dial: 0121 625 6846

Herefordshire Council
Planning Services
Our ref: L01058470

PO Box 4
Hereford

HR4 0XH 18 April 2019

Dear Mr Neilson

Arrangements for Handling Heritage Applications Direction 2015 & T&CP (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 & Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990

BROCKHAMPTON HOUSE, BROCKHAMPTON MEWS, BRINGSTY, WORCESTER, WR6 5TB

Application Nos 191002 & 191001

Thank you for your letters of 1 April 2019 regarding the above applications for listed building consent and planning permission. On the basis of the information available to date, we offer the following advice to assist your authority in determining the applications.

Historic England Advice

Brockhampton Court is listed Grade II* and is primarily significant as a mid-eighteenth century house designed by Thomas Farnolls Pritchard in the classical style. The principal building is an architectural set piece of controlled, graceful and finely worked proportion and detailing that is immensely pleasing to the eye with a refined plainness of style that avoids being austere and is complemented by the richness of its interiors. Service ranges to the rear appear to have a more complicated history that is not yet fully understood. The ground floor of the west wing has lost its historic plan and while it appears to be a later addition it is unclear how it related in functional terms to the principle building. The same is true of the east wing which appears to have been detached and only linked to the principle building in the twentieth century. Between the wings lay a rear yard overlooked by Pritchard's elegant Venetian and Diocletian staircase windows. It is unclear when the view from these was closed by the range comprising the dining hall and games room above, but the result detracts from Pritchard's design as does the roof and lantern over the morning room. Though of doubtful architectural merit the impact of these twentieth century additions is limited to views from the rear and does not affect the high quality relationship between the south and east fronts with the Grade II registered park and stunning wider landscape views beyond. The stable range forms part of a courtyard to the west of the house and is listed Grade II. Conversion into separate residential units has to a certain degree







severed the characteristic relationship between the two. Altogether, however, the house, buildings and landscaped park comprise a heritage asset of outstanding quality.

The proposals involve changes in the external appearance of twentieth century additions and to interior layout and circulation and include some loss of historic fabric. Compliance with policy contained in section 16 of the NPPF is therefore required, in particular with the following paragraphs:

- 189 requiring the applicant to describe significance to a level sufficient to understand the potential impact of the changes proposed,
- 193 requiring great weight, proportionate to the heritage asset's importance, to be given to its conservation,
- · 194 requiring any harm to be clearly and convincingly justified,
- 196 requiring less than substantial harm to be justified in terms of public benefits.

In order to avoid harm to significance when making changes to such an important heritage asset to accommodate twenty-first century patterns of living, it is important to put them in the context of historic phases of alteration to the house and its service structures. Having reviewed the submitted justification statement Historic England considers that a greater understanding that helps unpick the relationship between Pritchard's set piece and the rear service wings is necessary to understand the impact of the proposed changes. This is particularly so in respect of the lift which involves significant alterations to the layout of the rooms on the west side of the house and the loss of elements of principal floor beams.

In considering the proposals for the rear porch, we are concerned that the existing artificial stone structure does not enhance the significance of the listed building and that the addition of glazing will draw unfortunate attention to it. While the impact may not be sufficient for us to raise an objection, we question whether the desire for an enclosed rear porch does not present an opportunity to enhance significance by replacing the existing with a smaller, less architecturally ambitious structure with a tiled lean-to roof off the utility/conservatory passage that relates visually to the stables, garages and service ranges around it.

The proposed plans indicate that the insertion of new doors will be carried out to a quality of detailing and finish appropriate to the significance of the building. We are confident that the concerns we have raised regarding the lift and rear porch can be addressed.

Recommendation

Historic England has concerns regarding the applications on heritage grounds. We consider that the issues and safeguards outlined in our advice need to be







addressed in order for the applications to meet the requirements of paragraphs 189 and 194 of the NPPF.

Your authority should take these representations into account and seek amendments, safeguards or further information as set out in our advice. If there are any material changes to the proposals, or you would like further advice, please contact us.

Yours sincerely



Sarah Lewis

Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas E-mail: sarah.lewis@HistoricEngland.org.uk

cc: Hugh Shannon, Building Conservation Officer



