P 4 Architecture
A Member of the Chartered Institute of Architectural Technologists
Architectural & Construction Project Management Services

Lodge Hill, Wallbridge Drive, Leek
Staffordshire Moorlands, ST13 8NE
Mobile: (44) 07962 062 618
Email: P4architecture@hotmail.co.uk

Planning Department
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
Moorlands House
Stockwell Street
Leek
Staffordshire
ST13 6HQ

9th April 2020

Dear Planning Officer,

Re: Proposed Resubmission of Approved Application for Orangery and Link Section between Garage and Main Dwelling at Churnet Croft Cottage, Wood Road, Longsdon, Stoke-on-Trent, Staffs. ST9 9QB . For Mr L. Millward and Ms P. Walford.

The application is a resubmission of proposals which was approved on 25th May 2019 reference SMD/2019/0687. The details presented follow reconsideration of the project by my Client, against the conflicting officer views in support of the original details submitted. The result of the previous submission being my client's brief being substantially compromised in terms of the building's appearance. The application being approved in an extended period of determination, without due consideration of my own client's design requirements.

Churnet Croft Cottage has pointed out in the originally presented Design and Access Statement as been tastefully extended stone cottage which is neither Listed Status or in a Conservation Area. The original extension would amount to a net increase in floor space of approximately 9m2 and the proposal submitted sees no increase from that approved.

The proposal is for the replacement of a mahogany wood effect UPVC Conservatory with a traditionally designed painted timber clad Orangery of similar footprint. The scale and proportion of the detailing of the Orangery used in the creation of the Link Section sympathetically linking the main building with the Garage. The Garage being extended in the same materials as that of the existing Garage with cement render, stone quoins and plain clay roof tile finish. The main purpose here to provide a much-needed accessible Ground Floor toilet facility.

The main changes required by your Planning Office to achieve a positive outcome with the original application, was for a minimalist aluminium glazed frames and glazed roof Link Section and stone-built Orangery. The requested revisions to the design producing a contemporary element to the setting of the traditional stone cottage. Following a review of these combined elements with my client, we believe this to be subjective design and not necessarily considered appropriate for the cottage. The point being that the originally proposed painted timber Orangery and Link Section produces a much better balance of scale

and proportion relative to the Main House and Garage. The glazed Link Section proposal would not produce the desired visual separation, as the differences in level and the landscaping of neighbouring boundary area would detract from this ideological concept. Further technical detailing issues with regards to the sloping glazed roof running into a flat glazed roof and the weathering of the areas of abutment.

It is appreciated that extensions of this nature may produce many different views and opinions and feel my Client's research and review gives great baring to the correct solution. My Client commissioned visuals and consulted many local people to ask their opinions of the proposals with many providing written support for the original details submitted. The visuals were studied in great detail carefully examining each element which may produce issues and amendments made to drawings. The Orangery and Link Section timber framework detailing presented in a discreate and muted form, with the choice of an appropriate National Trust paint colour would produce a sympathetic and co-ordinated solution. It was considered a departure from the prominence of the stonework of the two storey stone main dwelling and a contrast to that of the Garage block was in fact the original proposal and was correct.

I trust the details put before you and reviewed by my client, may be seen in a positive light with appreciation of the extent to which my client has considered all aspects of the proposal. Should the opinion of your office remain resolute then my client will take advice on the proposal being taken to Appeal. The view that the proposal as it was originally submitted appeared to gain the support of the original Case Officer who had apparently written a supporting report. Only for the matter to be overturned, before revisions to the proposal were requested. Further confusions entailed when the Discharge of Conditions application was made, when the new Case Officer unbeknown to the history surrounding the proposal, chose to seek material amendments to the application. This was challenged and application granted permission. It is this inconsistency which demonstrates that there are and were conflicting views over the appearance of the proposal and on this basis produce subjectivity of our proposal which we put before you.

Kindest regards.

Philip

Philip Plant MCIAT
P4 Architecture

(M) 07962 062 618
(E) p4architecture@hotmail.co.uk

oof