

To / Ian Ansell
From / Fred Caillat
Date / 22nd September 2022
Your ref / EPF/0615/22 (LB) & EPF/0766/22
Our ref /
File ref / 000583



ADDRESS // GRANGE COURT, 72 HIGH ROAD, CHIGWELL, IG7 6PT

PROPOSAL // LISTED BUILDING CONSENT FOR MINOR AMENDMENTS TO THE NEW BUILD EXTENSION TO THE SOUTHEAST OF THE SITE, TO THE REAR OF THE GRADE II* GRANGE COURT. AMENDMENTS INCLUDE THE PROVISION OF A BASEMENT, INCREASE IN THE BUILDING LENGTH, CHANGES TO THE ENTRANCE LEVEL AND RAMP, AND INTERNAL LAYOUT AND ELEVATION CHANGES.

The significance of Grange Court

Grange Court was built in 1774; it has a handsome Georgian façade of classical design. Internally the majority of the principal rooms survive without subdivision and with important architectural features. The buff brick house with red brick and stucco dressings was refurbished by Sir Edwin Lutyens for his friend Sir Charles Baring in the early 20th century. The grand status of the house is reflected by the large drive at the front. The site has a long and complex history and played a prominent role in the history of the settlement of Chigwell.

It is the completeness of the plan form, quality of the architecture and the building's clear legibility as a fine example of its Georgian type, overlaid with Edwardian work that makes it deserving of its grade II* listed status. This places it in the top 5.5% of buildings in the country.

Relevant planning history

In 2017, a scheme, *ref. LB/EPF/3275/17 & EPF/3264/17* was submitted and granted for the conversion of the listed building and rebuilding of a large extension to the rear, to provide 14 flats with associated parking and landscaping. This approved scheme was the result of comprehensive and cooperative discussions between the applicants, the LPA and HE, in order to find a viable use of the listed building and the wider site, which would secure its future.

As part of the approved scheme for the redevelopment of the whole site and to achieve the financial viability of the project, evident compromise has been made to the scale and massing of the granted rear extension to provide an additional six apartments. In order to lessen the visual and spatial impact of the large rear extension onto the listed building and its setting, careful attention had been given to its design.

The current scheme

This scheme seeks consent for the amendments to the new build extension to the southeast of the site, to the rear of the grade II* Grange Court.

1. The provision of a basement

Supported: This does not raise any objections.

2. Increase in the building length

Not Supported: The cumulative impact of the changes is considered to increase the overall bulk of the extension and its dominance over the listed building.

m e m o

3. Changes to the entrance level and ramp

- The proposed changes are difficult to appreciate and their potential impact on the setting difficult to assess without the submission of a ground floor plan showing the extent / width of the amended ramp.

4. Elevation changes

Front Elevation

- *Pair of windows to front elevation to be the same, rather than large and small (as approved).* | **Supported.**
- *Flush, rather than projecting, balconies.* | **Supported.**
- *Enlarge the dormer window to the living rooms (2nd Floor) to improve light and air to the flats.* | While we could support the enlargement from two to three panes, the dormers (face included) cannot exceed the width the by-folding doors directly below. This adds an unacceptable level of bulk at roof level.

Roof level

- *As suggested by the planners, we show a brick chimney to contain the fireplace flues. This is more in keeping with the tradition of the main house and helps identify the massing of the flats.* | **Not Supported:** the proposed bricked chimney stacks are not considered acceptable as they appear incongruous within this clear modernist design approach. The treatment of the flues should reflect the approved design.
- *The top roof is shown as zinc with an almost flat (3 degree) pitch, rather than flat single ply (check DRC) membrane. This is more aesthetic, allowing a neat junction between top of the mansard roof and the main roof.* | **Supported.**

Rear elevation

- *We retain 4 bays to rear but propose two bays at roof level where the bays are formed within the roof design. To make the windows feasible, part of the mansard becomes vertical (as retained from the refused scheme). Rooflights are proposed serving bathrooms and the living room.* | **Not Supported:** As stated in previous comments, this change is not considered acceptable as it would detract from the composition of the elevation.

Flank Elevation

- *We propose additional windows and dormer window to the side elevations to serve the main bedrooms. This has been positioned to avoid overlooking issued.* | **Supported.**

Materials / Finishes

- As part of drawing no. TAD-1045, mention is made that: "*This application does not include any changes or amendments to the main house or landscaping. **Nor does it apply for changes to any of the conditions discharged on the previous consents, which includes materials, details etc.***", however some of the materials labelled on the proposed drawings differ from the materials approved as part of the DRC application, ref. EPF/0668/20. It is therefore unclear whether this application seeks permission for the use of new materials. No comment will be made on their acceptability until this point is clarified.

Recommendations

In line with the above, we CANNOT SUPPORT the entirety of the scheme and recommend the applicant to revise it in line with advice given throughout this comment. When revised plans are received, please re-consult.

This is supported by policy HC6, HC7, HC10 and HC12 of our Local Plan and Alterations (1998 and 2006), policy DM7 of our Submission Version Local Plan (2017), and paragraphs 189, 194, 195, 197, 199, 200, 202 and 206 of the NPPF (2021).

m e m o