

Darley Cliffe Hall – proposed extension

Process

After an agreement regarding a proposed extension occupying the area of the current courtyard on the west wide of the house had being agreed in principal with the LPA and their advisers (HE), the outstanding issues were:

1. The design of the Screen wall at the front.
2. The position of this front screen.
3. The roof its pitch, material construction and need or otherwise for a roof-light or lantern.

Consideration of these matters were taken by the architect who over a number of weeks and months produced a number of alternative design proposals that were in turn evaluated by the client and his Historic Building / Heritage Consultant to better advise him.

After due consideration a contemporary design producing a light-weight glazed screen wall was chosen rather than a traditional stone-walled and framed windows design. The LPA and HE were not privy to this design process and expressed an interest in how it was finally arrived at, so the proposals and their visual renders were submitted as part of the application process.

From comments received there were two particular concerns:

1. The design of the screen itself with no. 6 glazed panels did not reflect the 5-bay symmetry of the front façade. The use of small rectangular panels laid horizontally appeared over fussy and that the design of the screen needed reconsidering.
2. The position of the Screen wall was considered to be too far forward, and close to the corner of the front façade of the house. This was assessed as impacting negatively on it. It was suggested that the screen should be moved back from the front façade and to occupy a smaller floor area.
3. The proposed roof-light at the junction of the existing kitchen roof made it prominent and visually intrusive when viewed from the north side and front of the building.
4. Internally the blocked stone-framed window on the north side-elevation of the house, which formally lit the Dining Room, was partially cut across by the height of the roof with part inside, and part outside above the roof. In essence the internal ceiling (and roof) was not considered high enough.

This had previously been commented on by the HB/H Consultant to provide the architect some guidance towards a redesign. Stating:

1. “The front elevation has too many windows. If you take out the central window of each group of 3, and rebalance them as two windows to either side of the central

French doors you have a Georgian 5 –bay symmetrical façade like the house – better keeping with Classical proportions.

2. The new front looks a bit too low and squat. I recommend that a moulded cornice and ashlar parapet upstand is added above the windows, which should mask the view of the roof.
3. The whole building could be slightly taller I think,
4. Re. the visible part of the blocked window that I suggested (only today) could be opened up as a linking door to-and-from the Dining Room. The bit showing above the roof could be glazed as an over-light / fan-light. Or it could copy the upper part of the sash window (6-paned) at the first floor. This would then let in natural light into the side wall of the Dining Room and be the same size as the windows in the garden front elevation when viewed from inside of the dining room. The new doorway (with a part-glazed door) could form a useful connection for bringing food from the Kitchen, rather than through the main Stair Hall. Also it would keep guests out of the Kitchen So what you are really creating is a Breakfast Room with perhaps just a small cooking area / servery positioned just outside of the existing kitchen wall. This means really confining the actual kitchen units, fridges and cooking area to where it is, but maybe removing some of the door openings on the north side so it becomes less of a corridor".

PHT 2.02.2020

Revised Proposals

In response to these comments PBA have reconsidered the design and the position of the screen that is now considered to be more appropriate with 5 large glazed bay divisions, simplified and preened of any fussiness and set back sufficiently so as to reduce its impact and any visually intrusion on the garden front elevation of the house. The screen height has been increased so that the roof sits above the window-head entirely within the extension, rather than part of it outside of its height. The troublesome roof-light has now been totally removed as it is no longer considered necessary due to the increased level of day-light provided by the new screen in the extension. The roof design has been simplified to meet modern constructional practices designed to cause least impact on the historic building utilising tern-coated stainless-steel much favoured for replacing stolen lead roofs from listed church roofs – initially shiny it soon dulls down to a mat grey colour, not unlike lead. See: <https://twitter.com/aperamuk/status/666254451376791552>

Peter Thornborrow 21.02.2020