

17/00220/LBC and 17/00314/FUL  
Parish Council Representations

**Statement in support of Applications Refs: 17/00220/LBC & 17/00314/FUL – Glazed link extension at The Old Rectory, Ampney Crucis, GL7 5RY. District Cllr David Fowles, speaking on behalf of Ampney Crucis Parish Council**

Good afternoon.

Ampney Crucis Parish Council has asked me to read this statement on their behalf, as no Parish Councillor is available to be here today, due to work, holiday or other pre-existing commitments.

Your papers show that no comments had been received from the Parish Council. That is correct, as it normally only comments on applications where the Council has concerns over design, or wishes to object on planning grounds. "No comment" is therefore intended to indicate Parish Council support.

The Chairman of the Parish Council has subsequently confirmed to the Case Officer that the Council does support this application.

The Parish Council has exceptionally decided to give this statement as follows, in **SUPPORT** of the application:

The Old Rectory is a good example of a village house that has evolved over time. Its original 17<sup>th</sup> Century structure and layout was substantially altered and added to in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.

The current owners have taken a great deal of care to retain the character of the house when designing and implementing more recent changes.

The work has been, and continues to be undertaken to a high standard and in a sensitive manner.

This application proposes to link the main house with an outbuilding that had been converted for domestic use some years ago.

It is regularly used by Mrs McIntyre's mother when she visits for extended periods.

The proposed glazed link would provide sheltered access to the main house.

The innovative use of glazing would result in the link being as unobtrusive as possible in the overall setting of the house, while recognising that this is another step in the evolution of a building that has changed a lot over several hundred years.

When the original proposal was submitted, the Parish Council discussed the plans and considered them to be sensitive and appropriate. By bringing forward the existing drystone wall into the yard between the outbuilding and the main house, the appearance of the yard from Church Lane would be virtually unchanged.

However, we understand that the applicants were subsequently advised to consider moving the wall's position back from the yard by approximately 1.5 metres. As a consequence, the glazed screens on either side of the entrance to the ancillary building would be lost.

Following a site visit to review this current application, the Parish Council believes this to be a pity. It significantly changes the symmetry, visual balance and context of the two buildings.

The Council's position was and is, that the originally submitted scheme was preferable to the scheme under consideration today.

Nevertheless, we took the view that if the applicants were willing to make such changes, however detrimental to the original scheme, we would not object.

The Parish Council therefore asks you to **PERMIT** this application, and if possible, to encourage a review of the design such that the applicants may, if they wish, reinstate the originally proposed scheme.

2 mins 45 secs

# 17/00220/LBC and 17/00314/FUL Agent's Representations

17/00314/FUL & 17/00220/LBC – The Old Rectory, Ampney Crucis

12.07.17

Matthew Dyer, agent on behalf of the applicant, Mr & Mrs McIntyre

Hello

## **SLIDE 1 – SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

The first images you see are of the existing condition. We would welcome members to visit the site to help understand the context better. We met with the conservation officer there but we believe the case officer has not been onto the property.

## **SLIDE 2 – OPENINGS**

As you can see there is a wall already linking the two buildings. This is 1.98m high, it is not a low wall.

The buildings are in close proximity and the annex building blocks access to what is a large beautiful garden at the rear from the main house.

We have been sensitive to not propose reconfiguring the existing house in any way but utilise the existing hallway position in the house and large opening in the annex that you can see.

## **SLIDES 3 & 4 – EXISTING AND PROPOSED DRIVEWAY**

This is the existing and only view from the public road at the entrance to the property....

PAUSE

This is the proposed.

The proposal simply brings the wall forward slightly, with a glass link concealed behind.

One of the points made for refusal is that the proposal reduces the visual separation between the house and the annex. We feel the image demonstrates that this is just not the case and the two buildings are still separately defined

Another point made for refusal is that the proposal fails to preserve the appearance of the conservation area. This image is the only public view possible and we consider there is no impact. Further more the new gateway we are proposing, in the new wall, replicates one which has recently been approved on the adjoining lane, all be it ours will be at a reduced scale to a single door

## **SLIDE 5 – existing garden gateway on lane**

This will simply act as a garden gate in a drystone wall with no indication of the link behind so it is difficult to understand how the proposal fails to preserve the appearance of the conservation area. As noted by the parish council the local community supports the proposal. Ampney Crucis has a very sensitive and active community helping to preserve its character. If they had some concern we would have had objections; there were none.

## **SLIDES 6 & 7 – EXISTING AND PROPOSED GARDEN**

This is the existing view at the rear.....

PAUSE

This is the proposed

The frameless glass lightly connects to the existing building behind the wall and opens up views to the garden from the house.

In their report, the officer, **accepted** the proposal causes **less than substantial harm** but is then seeking public benefits to outweigh any harm. We would argue there is no harm and it is a private family home, I'm not certain how public benefits can be given. It is this lack of harm or impact that should be considered.

***SLIDE 8 – EXAMPLES***

There are many examples and precedents of this type of construction.

***SLIDE 9 – openings again***

With further regard to the impact on the existing building. What you are seeing is a revision to the original application. The original proposal submitted stepped over the existing opening to the annex and had absolutely no physical impact on the existing structures, other than moving the garden wall.

***SLIDE 10 – PREVIOUS APPLICATION***

This current proposal has therefore evolved through conversations with the conservation officer, ourselves and the client's own heritage consultant. The officer judged that the impact on the existing openings was of less concern than the visual impact of seeing glazing at the front.

Unfortunately, the officer then concluded her assessment of the application without seeing the revised elevations and so we feel did not review them satisfactorily but took a subjective view on the principle of the development.

***SLIDE 10 – PROPOSED FRONT VIEW - LEAVE ON SCREEN***