

IMMEDIATE CONTEXT AREA ANALYSIS IN RELATION TO THIS PROPOSAL

The immediate context of the site as shown on the previous pages is far less coherent than the surrounding area as a whole.

The houses opposite the property are all Victorian minus one infill house that is a modern construction in a neo-classical design at no 43a.

The south side of Lancaster Grove where our site is has previously been noted as being of an 'arts and craft' style.

Of the properties on the south side of the road that are visible from the street, there is an arts and crafts style property immediately next door at No 16. The fire station and it's neighbours are another example of this, but this is far further along the road. The strip of houses in which this site directly sits is not currently a coherent example of traditional arts and crafts houses.

Each house on this side of the road looks fairly different from the next.

The other neighbour at No. 22 is a modern property with no definitive style or era. The next property along, no 24, is equally of no architectural significance nor style.

Furthermore, and despite the examples of arts and crafts style properties, you will see from the previous pages, the only property that features a hipped roof of any form is our immediate neighbour at no 16.

Any argument that these are a feature of the surrounding area is fairly weak in our view as there are only three present, in the entire surrounding context analysed and only one of these is in the immediate area by the site.

The main treatment of roof wall joints on almost all of the surrounding properties are gable ends or a parapet wall. The bulk of the roofs are simple pitched roofs with considered detail to any additions / breaks to the roof line, but these are not all hipped roofs or pediments.

We also don't believe that an argument that relates purely to it looking 'similar to other properties' is a strong one from the council's standpoint. A building should be coherent within itself as well as providing a positive impact on its surroundings.

The current neo-classical approval is not in keeping with the surroundings.

There are a lot of comments regarding a previous application at the site which was far more arts and crafts in it's nature, but this is not the permission that we are building out nor seeking to change. The current extant permission as amended is neo-classical property and is not in keeping with the surroundings beyond the infill house opposite, but this is a freestanding detached dwelling.

HISTORIC CONTEXT OF SITE

As a brief reference point I attach here an image of the previous existing property and the current as built scheme from an approximate matching angle.

We do not believe that the approved building can be said to have reference to the previous form or style of the historic building on the site, in form nor materiality.

In fact, in the pre-existing house, the most imposing thing to the front elevation were the dormer windows to the roof - if we were to put the hipped roofs on and the central bay pediment (which increases it's current built height) we feel the building would be more imposing to the street.

In it's current and as proposed form there is a strong relationship between the building and the street and it generally feels more set back than the previous house here.



Image of front elevation from previous planning application showing original house on site prior to any development



Image of front elevation as currently constructed and proposed in this application (natural stone to be added to front central bay)

CURRENT APPROVAL IN CONTEXT

As a reference, the current approval is shown on this page as a direct comparison to what is currently built as a reference point to illustrate how much larger and more imposing the front elevation will become if completed.

We show this so that when read in conjunction with our reasons for the design changes it is clear as to what will be constructed if this application is unsuccessful.

Works to complete approved application 2017/5946/P to still be carried out:

- 2 x hipped roofs are to be added to the 2 side bays on top of the projecting bay areas and overhanging the front bay walls.
- Central bay to be clad in natural stonework (black granite) and central pediment added atop the already constructed central bay element.



Image (Top Right):

Front elevation as currently constructed (partially implemented)

Image (Right):

Front elevation as it would look if we complete the extant permission (reference 2017/5946/P)  
Hipped roof additions to match main roof and natural stonework to central bay (black granite).

(3D Sketch render).

This home is being designed for a family who intend on making it their permanent family home. It is not a development opportunity for them, this is simply an application to try to achieve a design that they are happier with for their home.

The current front elevation at the property is not finished and is a partially implemented state of the extant application 2017/5946/P as previously mentioned.

For reference, the applicants have stopped works on the front of the building for a few reasons;

Firstly that there are currently a landscaping team at the property doing the works that are linked to the conditions of the current application. This has meant a change of contractor and so there is a need to have any further permissions in place prior to commencement of any further works on the front elevation to the main building and these will be completed once the landscaping work is complete.

Secondly, as there have been so many obstacles and the main neighbourhood complaint has been the process and the continuation of works pre-approvals, this final application is sought ahead of any works to try to appease all parties.

The applicant acknowledges that some previous works were at their risk in terms of planning enforcement which was duly noted and dealt with in conjunction with the previous application at the site, but at this point, the building is at a point where the works have simply stopped.

They are not in breach of the extant approved minor amendment (2017/5946/P) and they are simply not complete. If this application is unsuccessful the works will be completed in accordance with the approved plans of 2017/5946/P.

This is not an exercise in cost saving either, it is an attempt to rationalise the design of a property they will live in as a family for many years to come.

## DESIGN STATEMENT

The design of this property has now evolved from the original neoclassical design that was originally approved in 2014, and in our view, for the better.

The rear of the building is a coherent piece of architecture that is respectful to its neighbours as well as being well detailed within itself. This is entirely constructed and in line with extant permissions and furthermore, the local authority members who visited the site during the previous application (including a conservation officer) commented on how good it looked.

The front of the building no longer relates to the rest of the building.

The front elevation if constructed in its approved form would actually provide an incoherence to the overall design of the house and we believe would diminish the strength of the design potential of this property in this location.

We do not believe that adding the approved hipped roofs to the front of the building will add any benefit to the building, nor the surrounding conservation area. It will actually increase the bulk and mass of the building at the key point where it faces the street.

Equally the increase in size to the current central bay by adding a central pediment to the top will dominate the front facade and make the house feel even more imposing on the street. We feel this pediment in particular also draws attention to the fact that it is one large property and it makes a large statement in the street scape as a result.

We certainly do not believe that the current scheme being completed will enhance the conservation area in which this house is located.

The removal of the central pediment and the hips makes the house feel far less ostentatious and actually by flattening off the three 'bays' there is a sense that it is potentially smaller than it is and could come across as 3 smaller houses rather than 1 larger property.

Furthermore we are suggesting a change in materiality to the central bay of the building.

The current application shows natural stone to the central bay - this would again make the central piece of the building very dominant as a contrast to the more traditional brickwork in which it sits.

We believe the central bay would be better detailed in brickwork to match the rest of the property and to minimise the impact of the building to the street as opposed to introducing another material and neo-classical detailing to a building that otherwise has none.

Finally, and in response to other applications we have done previously for the front elevation at this property, it is important for the council to appreciate that due to the setting of the building down from street level and behind an imposing historic wall, the only part of the building viewed from street level is the upper brickwork storey and roof. We feel this is important to note as to repeat an earlier point, the building in one material could then be read as a series of three which drastically reduces its visual impact to the street.

There is no question in our minds that if we build the central bay as per the extant permission and in a natural stone (black granite) then the building will have far more of a visual dominance than this proposal.

The following two pages detail the house in visual and built form:

- Page 12 shows the house as it will be built under the extant permission - with a 3D sketch image showing the materiality of the central bay and pediment and the hipped roof additions to the 2 x side bays.
- Page 13 shows the house as proposed in this application.
- Page 14 shows a direct comparison between the 2 x front elevation sketch images (as extant and as proposed)
- Page 15 shows a Full 3D Rendered image of our proposal in this application.

We believe that the proposal made in this application is the most refined approach for the a building of this size and in this location and hope the local authority agree.

WHOLE HOUSE IMAGES / DRAWINGS AS CURRENTLY APPROVED (2017/5946/P)  
This design will be implemented if this application is refused following an appeal process.



Front elevation as currently approved (2017/5946/P) - above

Rear elevation as currently approved (NO CHANGE from previous application) - below



Front elevation as it would look (2017/5946/P) - hipped roof additions and natural stonework to central bay (black granite) - 3D sketch render - Above.

Rear elevation as constructed in accordance with approved plans - Below

