

APP/14/00168 - 42 Bedhampton Hill, Havant PO9 3JW

This property was removed from the statutory list, but is of acknowledged local importance and would qualify for addition to the Council's local list. The local list is currently under review to bring closer into accord with English Heritage best practice on local designations. It qualifies as a non-designated Heritage Asset.

The latest proposals are comparatively modest and primarily affect the rear, most altered and least architecturally complete elevation. I have no objection in principle to what is proposed but seek some modifications and refinements as detailed below.

The following comments are based on a desktop study using the photographic material contained in the Design & Access Statement submitted for the earlier development in the grounds (APP/13/00457 refers).

1. Removal of screen wing wall (front elevation) and provision of hipped slate roof over existing ground floor addition. No objection. The first floor screen wall is something of a curiosity. From recollection (not shown on photos) the wall is contiguous with the main build and therefore there will be some making good of the scarred elevation necessary. Undertaken to a high standard this would not compromise the building's architectural/historic interest and has the potential to enhance it.
2. The property is constructed of a gault/buff "Beulieu type" brick. The modest rear extension addition raises and extends the present structure in the same plane, requiring a dead match. This is achievable, but requires extreme care. If minded to grant permission, necessary to condition the requirement for the construction of a sample brick panel on site for approval. Without seeing a sample panel of the proposed Ibstock Bradgate brick, I am not in a position to advise on acceptability.
3. With the partial rebuilding of the rear elevation there is the opportunity to improve the ground floor window proportions. The existing and proposed windows have a horizontal emphasis whereas the character of the building is strongly vertical. I appreciate the windows serve the kitchen, where worktops can influence the cill height. Nevertheless it should be possible to modify to a window design which better complements the character of the main building. Request this aspect of the proposal be reconsidered.
4. On the materials page of the document further refinements are shown for the windows than identified on the accompanying drawings e.g stone cills and window heads. Welcome but can locations be clarified. In a similar vein, no details of materials for proposed windows. Would expect painted timber to match and traditionally opening vertical sliding sash (not pivot or top hung) where this applies. Confirmation please.
5. The present outbuilding is a mixture of materials and poor composition of forms and of no particular merit. I have no objection to its remodelling or in reality, essentially a rebuild.. However, I feel what is proposed is a lost opportunity. The mean false pitch roof reads unconvincingly. The first floor existing window serves a bathroom. I have sketched a basic illustration of how this could be improved while utilising the same footprint. Not quite sure

quite what lies behind the eternit cladding. I thought initially it was to cosmetically dress up parts of the existing building but seems pretty much a complete rebuild. There is an argument for a different but complementary design, but not what is shown. The white eternit cladding will be a stark element which will stand out rather than being recessive. Given a new complimentary buff brick is being employed elsewhere, I would advise carrying this forward into the revised outbuilding. If a contrasting material is required I suggest larch cladding (as commonly employed on many developments) would be a better alternative – requiring a relatively low maintenance regime.

John Townsend
Conservation Consultant
06//03/14