

CONSERVATION CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Application No: 21/00946/FUL

Case Officer: Nina Chana

Heritage Assets: Non-Designated Heritage Asset

Address: Arrow Cottage, Old Rectory Lane, Alvechurch, B48 7SU

Proposal: Extension and alterations to dwelling to include two storey side extension and re-roofing of house and garage.

Date: 12/12/2022

Position

The significance of the NDHA and relevant policy considerations have been covered in the previous consultation on this application.

The revised proposals represent an improvement over the previous submission, however, they are still considered to cause harm to the NDHA in their current form. There are also errors/omissions in the submitted drawings which should be updated to enable accurate assessment. The more detailed comments below take each elevation in turn:



Figure 1- Proposed elevations marked with drawing omissions and areas of concern

Front Elevation: The design now better preserves the character and appearance of the NDHA, however the new continuous ridgeline from the existing substantially extends the perceived width of the dwelling. It may be possible to mitigate this by stepping down the extended upper ridgeline, and also the lower link ridgeline connecting to the Garage/Utility roof, providing an overall subservient hierarchy for the newer elements.

Side (Northeast) Elevation: No adverse comments.

Side (Southwest) Elevation: There appears to be a window missing in this elevation, from the proposed Dining Room. No adverse comments apart from this.

Rear Elevation: There appears to be a door missing from the proposed external WC. I have a number of concerns with the remainder of the elevation:

1. The arrangement between pitched Master Bedroom roof and flat Stair/Store/Ensuite roof appears haphazard. This could perhaps be resolved by introducing more articulation in the façade, separating the pitched and flat roof elements.
2. The flat roofed Kitchen element is similarly awkward; again articulation in the façade could resolve this so that it is perceived as a separated element.
3. The Juliette balcony window with gable over does not match the width shown in plan and, as a feature in general, it is incongruous with the Arts & Crafts aesthetic. This would be preferred as a simple window or, if the roof arrangement were to be suitably revised, as a full dormer window.
4. The three ground floor window/patio doors appear identically sized and designed, which is at odds with the rest of the dwelling where most windows and doors are unique. The façade revisions suggested above might also resolve this issue, as the designs would need to be revised to suit the articulation.

I am aware of the applicant's fallback position using permitted development rights. The proposed single-storey Snooker/Games Room and two-storey Study/Bedroom extensions subject of 20/01300/CPL could be carried out in addition to this consent, should it be forthcoming. I have therefore not considered their impact in terms of whether or not this proposal or the fallback position would be more harmful in heritage terms.

From the rear, I consider the current proposals and fallback position to have comparable impact; the current proposals are more sensitively detailed, but their greater scale increases the impact, offsetting this design quality.

From the front, I consider the current proposals to be more harmful than the fallback position, due to the increased scale and visibility from the street, and the diminished sense of separation between the main dwelling and its garage.

On balance, then, I consider the current proposals to be more harmful than the available fallback position, principally due to the increased sense of scale, mass, and connected form from the front elevation, which fails to preserve or enhance the character of the NDHA. Further revisions to the designs which address the issues raised above may overcome these concerns.

Peter Jenkins
BA(Hons) PGDipArch PGDip PGDipCons ARB

Conservation Officer