

BY E-MAIL

peter Hamilton planning consultancy
PO Box 195
Liverpool
L17 0YS
M: 07866 700524
E: peterhamilton@ph-planning.co.uk

Page | 1

31 August 2023

Knowsley Borough Council
Planning Division
PO Box 26
Archway Road
Huyton
L36 9FB

Dear Mr Hunt

Application references: 22/00474/FUL and 22/00475/LBC

Greenhill, 4 The Orchard, Huyton, Knowsley, L36 5UZ

Conversion of outbuilding, including the erection of a single storey extension to south and west elevations, and the demolition and reconstruction of east gable wall to form 1 no. dwelling and associated works.

Further to your e-mail dated 13 July with an attachment from your Conservation and Design team which set out some queries and concerns about some elements of the detail of the proposals (shown in red below), we would respond as follows.

Over 16m of the existing high brick garden wall to the west is to be demolished; the rear wall of the new building will effectively replace this, but drawings indicate this is set on a different line and creates a small dogleg in the line of the wall. This change in position is not appropriate. Is there a reason for this that we should take into account? The wall here, while an original feature at its core, is not in a good state of preservation with much evidence of patching up and scars of past alterations of low significance. Historically outbuildings were built backing onto this wall and would have provided restraint, the current buttresses have probably been added to compensate. Rebuilding of this element in the context of the extension would be acceptable, provided the detail and materials are appropriate, match the original construction and set on the original line of the wall. Drawings should be revised and the design notes document updated to provide details of brick and brick bond, and proposals for tie-in.

Following a review of the boundary wall, there is no step in its alignment at the location of the 2no. buttresses. I attach photographs showing the wall at these locations. It appears that the

original topographical survey in respect of this was incorrect. As such, the existing site plan drawing has been amended as shown on drawing no. 1533-002 Rev B. The proposed extension is set on the alignment of the existing boundary wall as shown on drawing no. 1533-004 Rev G and there is no dog leg at the southern end of the extension. The proposed materials are shown on the materials note on the proposed elevations drawing no. 1533-005 Rev F and in the design note. Drawing no. 1533-004 Rev G includes details of how the proposed extension will tie in with the retained elements of the existing boundary wall.

The upward extension of the front wall of the former stable and creation of a valley gutter is not sympathetic. The existing eaves line and details should be maintained. This will necessitate some lowering of /angle change of the proposed glazed link roof. This would seem achievable given the existing gutter is shown to be approx. 3m above ground level.

The proposal has been amended to reflect this comment. Please see the proposed elevations drawing no. 1533-005 Rev F.

The removal of the west end wall of the building involves removal of the wall with the internal arched features. This wall, and primarily these features should be physically retained. These features, the doorway and remnant elements of the flooring speak to its original use as a stable. The arched features are most likely remnant elements of the hayracks. Their loss would result in a loss of evidential and design significance and is not clearly justified. The layout should be adjusted to enable retention of this wall/features.

The existing western end wall is now retained as shown on drawing nos. 1533-004 Rev G and 1533-005 Rev F. The internal features to this wall can therefore be retained.

Some details of materials and finishes have been provided within the 'Notes on Design' document. This is helpful and should be an 'approved document' in any approval. However the document is not comprehensive and further details will be required. Certain aspects can be left to conditions, however I would recommend further details/amendments be sought upfront about the following:

- Materials and details of windows to extension. I would recommend painted timber, with reasonably slender details and traditional mortise and tenon joints to reflect the existing (i.e. not mitred joints)

Please see drawings 1533-006, 007 and 008 which show the details of the proposed windows and bi-fold doors.

- All new RWG to the extension should be cast iron to match the existing, and fascia should be clarified as timber.

The proposed materials are shown on the materials note on the proposed elevations drawing no. 1533-005 Rev F and in the Design Note.

- I am concerned about the appropriateness of the single ply roof membrane proposed. These are often quite plasticky in appearance – further details should be requested. Profiled metal, lead or zinc would be more suitable options.

Page | 3

The proposal has been amended to include a profiled metal roof to the extension as shown on drawing nos. 1533-004 Rev G and 1533-005 Rev F.

Landscaping

The position of the new landscape area in front of the former garage door openings is out of character with the history of the building, and would have an effect on the setting of the listed building. I would advise this be altered to a continuation of the hardstanding. Nevertheless the applicant could be advised that freestanding planters would not require any consent. The use of block pavements is not recommended as these are not attuned to the character of the site, stone setts or cobbles would be more appropriate to the setting of the building.

The proposal has been amended to reflect this comment. Please see the proposed site and ground floor plans drawing no. 1533-004 Rev G.

Stone wall fronting The Orchard

The stone wall repair spec and method statement is broadly acceptable, however ensuring the NHL lime mortar is damp for 3 days only won't be sufficient, esp in high temperatures. Lime work should also not be carried out where temperatures that fall to less than 5C or above are expected. The method statement should be expanded to account for seasonal variations in temperature, as it is uncertain when the works will be carried out.

Please see amended Method Statement which incorporates the above comments.

The proposal includes building a new wall directly against the rear of the short section of stone wall fronting The Orchard. How will this element be treated? How might foundations be affected etc?

The proposal has been amended to remove this element of the proposal.

Other

A proposal for separate dwelling would be more problematic than an annexe, as there would be resulting impacts on the setting of the listed building. The layout of the site would be negatively

affected if existing historic access routes are stopped up, or new fences erected within the courtyard on the 'red line' of the application site. My understanding is that this is intended as an annexe, and I would recommend that it be agreed that any permission be tied to its use being in connection with the main dwelling. It would be helpful if the submission clarified the intention – which I understand is as an annexe to the main house in any case.

Page | 4

As we have previously responded, the applicant is content for a condition to be imposed on any planning permission for the dwelling to be used only by people related to the occupiers of the main dwelling.

The conversion of this building effectively leaves the primary listed house without any garaging or outside storage buildings which is atypical of a dwelling of this size. There are no options to site a new garage within the remainder of the grounds in the future without harm to the setting of the listed building. The applicant should be advised of this limitation going forward. Retaining this building/area as part of the larger site means that further adaptation in the future would be possible.

This is noted by the applicant.

I trust these amendments are acceptable and now enable you to promptly and positively determine both the planning and listed building consent applications. Should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely



Peter Hamilton, MRTPI
pHpc

Enc:

Drawing Nos. 1533-002A, 1533-004 Rev G, 1533-005 Rev F, 1533-006, 1533-007 and 1533-008.

Boundary Wall photographs August 2023
Boundary Wall Method Statement Revision A
Design Note Revision A

CC: Colin Daniels