
Paul Hirst Design Services (PHDS)

PLANNING AND ACCESS STATEMENT FOR TWO STOREY INFILL EXTENSION TO REAR, REPLACING CONSERVATORY, REPOSITIONING FRONT DOOR AND NEW ENTRANCE PORCH AT STABLE COTTAGE, THE STREET, HAMSTREET, ASHFORD, KENT. TN26 2HG

Contents:

- 1.0. Background.**
- 2.0. Use.**
- 3.0. Amount.**
- 4.0. Layout.**
- 5.0. Scale.**
- 6.0. Landscaping.**
- 7.0. Appearance.**
- 8.0. Access.**
- 9.0. Sustainability.**
- 10.0. Conclusion.**

1.0. BACKGROUND.

1.1. The Client has lived at this property for many years and is dedicated to the preservation and improvement of this building as his home. The client has considered the position in respect of the maintenance and sustainability of the building. In an attempt to maintain the fabric by protecting the structure and hence improving energy saving, this application is submitted for consideration.

1.2. The need for support to applicants who are contributing to preserve the retention of our heritage should be encouraged by the Local Authority.

2.0. USE.

2.1. The development constitutes the provision of a two storey infill pitched roof extension. Patio doors are specified to the ground floor of the attachment as an improvement in light and ventilation. The site is currently occupied by one large, detached Building in a Conservation Area. That building is being refurbished for retention as a dwelling. Other works include minor improvement to facilities and redecoration.

2.2. In land use terms the site is currently used for housing. Those conforming uses will continue. To claim that the development would harm the character of this Conservation Area would be unreasonable. The development is within the confines of a complex of large buildings. The provision of patio doors is in a concealed location behind the extensive bulk of Stable Cottage. The other works are set within the built envelope of an existing Building in residential use. Due to the individuality and specific character of this Cottage the principle of modest works has been adopted.

3.0. AMOUNT.

3.1. The efficient use of Stable Cottage is the motivation for this planning application.

3.2. The large plot size is consistent with the space expected of a village location. There is sufficient space for the accommodation of these works on this plot. Sufficient amenity space is allocated for recreation to the side, front and rear of the building. That will be maintained.

Paul Hirst Design Services (PHDS)

4.0. LAYOUT.

4.1. The layout is dictated by the need to maximize the use of the space available. There are only two small openings in the western elevation of the building. Patio doors will afford improvement in light and ventilation. Consideration had to be given to the desirability of a clear aspect from the western elevation of the property. Accordingly, the doors were situated to maximize light to those elevation windows. It is of paramount importance to the occupants that maximum natural light is incorporated for the enjoyment of their surroundings. An improvement which maximizes the use of natural elements by deriving light is a precept of this proposal.

5.0. SCALE.

5.1. This is a small-scale development. Every attempt has been made to keep the proposals to a modest, congruous size, consistent with useable and practical room sizes.

5.2. The bulk and scale of the building is unaltered. The extension is hidden in a setback area at the rear of the property.

6.0. LANDSCAPING.

6.1. Significant amounts of planting currently exist adjacent to the site boundaries. That planting will be supplemented to enhance the visual attraction of the property.

6.2. The car parking and access is unaffected by the proposal.

7.0. APPEARANCE.

7.1. Stable Cottage is predominantly a two storey gable ended building containing a variety of window and door designs and architectural styles. The intention is to make the proposed development integrate in the Conservation Area with the proposal providing minimal environmental impact.

8.0. ACCESS.

8.1. Existing vehicular and pedestrian access will be used.

9.0. SUSTAINABILITY.

9.1. Any objection on the grounds of non-sustainability would be difficult to understand. Such a test has not been an overriding consideration for the large number of Buildings in Conservation Areas, which have been extended, refurbished, or converted to dwellings or commercial use in other villages.

9.2. The Client has taken a responsible and structured approach to this sustainable development by considering the social, environmental, and economic impacts of their activities. BS 8900 has been considered as the lead document in that process.

10.0. CONCLUSION.

10.1. The development would not harm the character or appearance of the Conservation Area or the village surroundings.

14 January 2021

Paul Hirst Design Services (PHDS)

HERITAGE STATEMENT.

TWO STOREY INFILL EXTENSION TO REAR, REPLACING CONSERVATORY, REPOSITIONING FRONT DOOR AND NEW ENTRANCE PORCH AT STABLE COTTAGE, THE STREET, HAMSTREET, ASHFORD, KENT. TN26 2HG

Contents:

- 1.0. Introduction.
- 2.0. Planning Policy Context.
- 3.0. Assessment of the Heritage Asset.
- 4.0. Impact on the Heritage Asset.

1.0. Introduction.

1.1. This statement has been prepared to accompany an application for Planning Consent.

2.0. Planning Policy Context.

2.1. PPS 5 was published on the 25 March 2010 and sets out the Governments national policies on the conservation of the historic environment along with accompanying Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide.

2.2. Paragraph 6 of PPS 5 confirms planning has a key role to play in conserving our heritage assets and utilizing the historic environment in creating sustainable places. The guidance goes on to suggest that the Governments overarching aim is that the historic environment should be conserved and enjoyed for the quality of life they bring to this and future generations.

2.3. Paragraph 7 of PPS5 recognizes that managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term and LPAs should take account of the wider social, cultural, economic, and environmental benefits of heritage conservation.

2.4. Policy HE6 confirms that LPAs may require an applicant to provide a description of the significance of the heritage assets affected and the contribution of their setting to that significance. The level of detail should be proportionate to the importance of the heritage asset and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on the significance of the heritage asset.

2.5. Policy HE7 of PPS5 sets out a number of general principles in determining consents for heritage asset applications. The particular nature of the heritage asset and the value it holds for future generations.

3.0. Assessment of the Heritage Asset.

3.1. The property consists of the main original building designated on the attached block plan drawing. Stable Cottage is of modest architectural and historic interest.

It is not Listed and comprises a brick-built gable ended building with a plain tile roof. The passages from the Conservation Listing of the original house are not clear in their assessment of the heritage asset.

Paul Hirst Design Services (PHDS)

3.2. The original building under consideration was erected around 1860 of modern local material at that time. Inclusion of the attached garage must be circa 1960. By virtue of the alterations associated with the buildings to date, the proposal represents minimal detrimental effect on the Conservation Area. The subject Building has a plain tiled roof. There is inadequate roof space to provide a second floor within the envelope of the existing construction. Therefore, an extension has been designed and submitted to afford current day living standards.

3.3. The new porch is to be timber framed by traditional craft methods. The external supports will be a natural timber finish. A roof of plain tiles to compliment the Conservation area has been specified. This proposal has conservation merit sufficient for the grant of planning permission. It is submitted that the new extension does not present a detrimental effect on the Conservation Area or the surroundings. In fact, it is more complimentary and fitting than other developments in the area.

3.4. The application site has planning history and the significance of the heritage asset has probably been discussed and assessed on numerous occasions. The proposed two storey infill has in my view no significant detrimental architectural or historic effect on the Conservation Area. The proposal will not cause a distraction from the integrity of the Heritage Asset.

4.0. Impact on the Heritage Asset.

4.1. The proposed changes to the Conservation Area provide an improvement in current day living standards and the use ability for the residents. The majority of the proposed works will be executed remote from the main views of the Conservation Buildings and are minor in nature. The proposed works will have little impact on the heritage asset.

4.2. Details of the proposal are clearly shown on the submitted drawings and in the Planning and Access Statement. As the assessment has shown the existing building is not of significant historic or architectural interest. The proposal is an improvement to the Conservation Area.

4.3 Gable ends, close couple roofs and plain tiles have been used in the design to replicate the current built form and provide harmonious continuity of the Conservation Area.

14 January 2021.