

NP/DDD/0115/0058: Newhaven Lodge

Comments from Sue Adam 02.03.15

1. Conversion of single storey barn.

This barn was listed on 27.7.84. It received PP and LBC for conversion to a residential dwelling in 1993. According to the current LBC application works started in 1995, so the original LBC application is still valid. The Proposed drawings submitted with the current application do not match the approved drawings in a number of ways and are therefore inaccurate (the 'Existing' drawings submitted with this application are also inaccurate).

Works should be carried out in accordance with the approved Listed Building Consent application WED0493164. If the owner wishes to change any of the approved details, he will need to make this clear (with strong justification)

2. New windows for the farmhouse.

Drawings have been submitted for some new windows to the main farmhouse, although this is not referred to in the Description of Proposed Works.

Insufficient information has been submitted for me to comment on these. We need a justification for the changes, existing and proposed elevations drawn to scale and scaled section drawings of each windows. If the new sashes (Windows E) are to be based on the existing sash on the SE elevation, then this should be replicated exactly, e.g. in terms of frame and glazing bar sizes, moulding details, opening mechanism, etc. and also whether the frame has horns or not (our photos suggest that the existing sash has no horns, which is an important original detail).

Note: the Proposed drawings are not accurate: the doors have 6 panels to their top half, not 9 as shown; the proportions of the ground floor window to Windows C make it look as if this opening is smaller than the one above (photos suggest that this is not the case) - if it is smaller, then 9 panes is too many for the opening as the proportions of the panes are horizontal rather than vertical).

3. Building B.

The Existing drawing is inaccurate: the single storey section at the south end is covered in sheet, not blue slate.

The ground floor window at the north end appears, from photos, to be an inward opening hopper: if this is correct, we would not wish to see this traditional window replaced with a fixed window without a very strong justification.

Where corrugated sheet is to be replaced with stone slate, we need to see details of the existing and proposed roof structure – will new roof timbers be required in order to support the stone slate, or are the original timbers still in situ? Any strengthening required?

4. Building A.

Any new garage opening on the yard elevation will require a very strong justification – none has been provided. There is already a large garage opening on the gable end of this building. In advice given to the owner on 29.03.14, Catherine Mate suggested blocking the gable end opening with stonework slightly inset, to highlight the surrounds to the opening. In the submitted application, there is no indication of whether the gable end opening is to be retained or blocked up. It is unlikely that we would accept a new garage opening on the yard elevation if the gable end opening is retained.

We would need to see fully scaled drawings before the proposed new opening could be accurately assessed. We would also need to see details of the proposed new doors, how they would be hung and of the stone surround to the new opening.

The submitted drawings are not accurate: stable doors are shown as plain boarded doors; the openings at the south-east end (right-hand side) are not shown correctly on either the Existing or Proposed drawings.

The proposed new hopper window is not drawn correctly: only the top or bottom pane of the hopper should be inward opening, whereas the drawing shows the whole window opening inwards. We need to see detailed, scaled drawings of the proposed new window.

A 6-pane window is proposed for the blocked opening at the far right (first floor) of the building. However, in photos this appears to be a blocked doorway or pitching hole and we would not, therefore, want to see any subdivision if glazed. We need a strong justification for why this opening is to be unblocked and why glazing is proposed: if the building is to remain in agricultural use, it would be preferable to fit a plain boarded door (hung internally or externally on pintles, depending on what evidence remains of previous fixings) rather than glazing.

The existing opening at the right-hand end of the frontage, with an externally hung timber door (between the two first floor openings) is not shown on either the Existing or Proposed drawings: is the intention to block this up and then create the new garage door opening?

SUMMARY

I recommend refusal of this application, as insufficient information has been provided and much of the information that has been provided is inaccurate.

LBC has already been approved for conversion of the single storey barn to a residential dwelling.