

201	Case ref. no:	Y17/0252/SH
Property Address:	Burlington Hotel, 3-5 Earls Avenue, Folkestone	
Proposals:	Erection of side and rear conservatory	
Application Type	Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent	
Agent:		
General Comments Operative Conditions?		
Listing / C/A?	Grade II, Conservation Area	
Date Consult Received:	26/05/2017	
Date Comments Sent:	21/06/2017	

Comments:

General Description:

The Burlington Hotel is an extremely large Victorian building on the corner of *Earls Avenue* and *The Leas*, with the main entrance facing Earls Avenue. The site being considered for development is a sunken area on the West side of the building, to the left hand side of the side, southern frontage which faces onto The Leas. The area, currently a neglected garden courtyard, is close to the boundary with the large garden area of The Grand Hotel.

Historic Building Description and Significance:

The Burlington Hotel was erected in 1893 and appears to comprise of three main ranges – the main corner block consisting of a four storey house-like building with another range attached to its South side facing The Leas. The hotel also extends to the North to incorporate a second house unit and it is clear from old maps that the buildings were linked together later, after 1897 but before 1907.

The whole of the hotel is designed in a sort of free-styled Jacobian Flemish style, red brick with extensive use of buff terracotta dressings around windows and to form the Dutch style gables that are a distinctive feature of the building. The main entrance porch, approached by a broad flight of steps, is classically detailed with an arched entry flanked by panelled pilasters and a strap work over-panel with the date 1893 and above, an additional blank feature panel surmounted by a broken Baroque pediment – all this in the pale buff terracotta blockwork.

The Bastion Tower,
16 Pound Lane,
Canterbury,
Kent CT1 2BZ

Tel: 01227 462 680
mail@anthonyswaine.co.uk
www.anthonyswaine.co.uk

The interior is also highly detailed with extensive use of dark panelling and other classical features, mostly original but adapted and augmented by the current owners over the last 50 years. The principle staircase, of dark wood in the Jacobian style, and with a magnificent stain glass mullion window is the crowning feature of the interiors.

The hotel has been substantially altered in more recent times with additional dormers and attic mansards. On the West side, there is a substantial single storey rear extension which contains a sizable room, part of the basement bar and restaurant areas. The flat roof of this building has, more recently, been converted into an open terrace, covered in Astroturf, to provide an external amenity area for the hotel.

The proposed extension would be attached to the front of this 1930's extension, necessitating the removal of a large stone mullioned bay window, and also attached to the side of an existing bar cellar area – a modern narrow single storey flat roofed extension attached to the West side of the plinth of the original building.

Development Proposals:

The proposal is to build a part brick, part glazed, extension to the front of the existing single storey flat roofed extension, which extends to the rear (West) of the main hotel building.

The proposal involves the removal of a large mullioned canted bay window, formed of seven casements with moulded reconstructed Bath stone mullions and transoms on a brick base. This work would be replaced by an opening into the new bar area with sliding partition doors.

The work also involves blocking up of the existing doorway into the bar area and the extension would be attached to the existing modern bar cellar area which involves the raising of the existing external wall of this modern extension.

The proposed conservatory extension would be about 6.5m square with a glazed hipped conservatory roof with a flat roof margin and a, presumably, white aluminium fascia on two sides (the South and West). The side wall is part brick with a wide five bay fixed glazed window (white aluminium sections).

The front (South) wall facing The Leas comprises of a pair of fully glazed doors with fan lights over, with full length fixed windows to either side – and the arrangement not unlike a shopfront (all white aluminium sections).

Relevant Documents: Previous drawings (not re-presented) In grey

David Thompson Architectural Services drawings-(draft 5A-10-5-2017):

- PG no:01 – Plan as Existing
- PG no:02 – Roof Plan as Proposed-(draft 5A-10-5-2017)
- PG no:03 – Elevations as Existing
- PG no:04 – Elevations as Proposed-(draft 5A-10-5-2017)
- PG no:05 – Location/Block Plan

Design and Access Statement and Heritage Statement

Astounding Interiors – layout plan and wall elevations – Drawing 07
Wendland Conservatory Details)

- Patent Glazing bar detail - Styal 3405
- Edwardian Hip bar detail - Styal 3407
- Apex Ridge detail Styal - 3717

Elephant Roof plan job 408812

Un-named drawings:

Side Elevation - (showing window frames)

Front Elevation - (showing door frames)

Photos

- Showing glazing bar/gutter connection
- Showing Ogee gutter in elevation

Large scale frame details RWT55:

- Tilt only sash in frame
- Mullion profile
- Sash profile
- Door frame and sash
- Window frame profile

Comments:

Comments on the latest additional / amended plans shown in Blue

Previous Comments retained and shown in Grey

Previous comments:

The proposals follow on from a pre-submission meeting held on site with Mr Sangiuseppe Senior and Junior, Alex Kalorkoti and Clive Bowley at the beginning of September 2016. At that meeting, a conservatory extension built in that location was agreed to be acceptable in the interests of upgrading the rather gloomy restaurant areas within the 1930s extension.

It was also agreed that the existing seven bay mullioned window was a rather poor pastiche of the windows in the main building and, because of this, it was agreed this could be taken out to allow an opening through from the extension into the main restaurant area. The suggestion was also made that the existing bar cellar extension detracted from the character of the building and the quality of internal spaces but it seems that removal of this section of the building is not possible and is not part of the proposals.

There was also a discussion about the design and Mr Sangiuseppe was keen not to have a pastiche design, suggesting instead a modern design was required, and this was also considered acceptable subject to the proviso that the detailing had to be of the highest architectural quality (a copy of the notes of that meeting are included at that end in brown).

The proposals are however for a very basic utilitarian structure made from standardised sections inserted into a basic red brick box structure and with a flat roof with a large hipped roof and glazed lantern covering the majority of the space.

Presentation Drawings

The application drawings are of the most basic level possible. The proposal is shown with only a fragment of the adjoining plan and elevations of the existing building shown and, in particular, the proposed elevations show almost no detail of the existing building and what the structure is to be attached to except for the barest of detail of the parapet of the 1930s flat roofed building. There is no drawing showing the building elevations as a whole so as to give context, nor of the improved access to The Leas (with disabled ramp) that the applicant stated was their intention to build, nor is there any changes to the planting or boundary wall that were discussed.

The side elevation fails to show the relationship with the higher ground to the West of it so the appearance of the building cannot be judged in its context.

The detailed drawings proposed are simply a trade catalogue and a series of full size aluminium profiles of the window and door profile; nowhere are there any drawings of how the building is to be detailed or assembled, the relationship between the brickwork and the window section for example. There are no details of the fascia or flat roofed junction or the junction with the hipped roof and also no cill details. The Heritage and D&A Statement is extremely short, but to the point!

Considering only the drawings, my view is that the application drawings are entirely inadequate for an extension to the Grade II building of this quality. They do not adequately describe the construction of the proposed building as a whole, nor the effect of its appearance on the existing hotel building.

What is needed at the very least are the following drawings:

1. South and West elevation of the hotel building with the proposed extension shown – to illustrate context
2. Details of the treatment of the forecourt area between the extension and The Leas to show the proposed paving materials

- and details of access steps/ramps, etc
- 3. Detailed sections through the building showing the construction of the cill/head and fascia/flat roof/lantern glazing, all show together as building sections. Two sections will be needed; one through the window and one through the main glazed screen
- 4. Details of the treatment of the jambs of the opening formed from the removal of the stone bay window and details of the proposed finishes to the external walls within the extension

Comments on the latest submission:

The current drawings are in addition to those submitted in March 2017.

These show revisions to the overall design to include the following:

1. David Thomas drawing PG04 – amendments to show a corner post rather than a brick pier, with a set of four opening French doors, with side lights to either end.
2. David Thomas drawing PG02/Elephant Windows Roof Plan – The roof plan also shows a greater number of patent glazing bars set out in a more logical arrangement –
3. Outstanding Interiors drawing 07 – This shows the internal layout and arrangement of all the interior basement rooms of the restaurant
4. 3D Image
5. Side Casements
6. Various Glazing Bar Details
7. Photo of Roof Bar and Gutter Detail.

Design Issues

Previous comments:

Whilst the overall plan and positioning is as discussed at the pre-meeting, and is acceptable in principle, (as is the acceptance of the removal of the bay window), the proposed design is of a very poor quality – a standardised design with the appearance of a low grade commercial shopfront.

The proposal is quite simple but from the limited information to hand, the following aspects of the design need further consideration or redesign:

1. **The “Shopfront”** – This very simple design would benefit from some sort of mullioned section to either side of the doors. This could be a simple aluminium box section. The fan light over should be single pane, not two as shown. The whole frame should be set back 100mm from the face of the brickwork.
2. **The Window** – The module of the window is too wide and this should be reduced to a maximum of 600mm with additional mullions. This would appear more in scale with the fenestration of the main building which forms the back drop. The whole frame should be set back 100mm from the face of the brickwork with a subcill.
3. **Fascia Detail** – No detail is provided but this needs to have a projecting element like a cornice, perhaps have a cornice gutter so as to reduce the apparent depth of the feature.
4. **The Conservatory Roof** – The information suggests that this is to be glazed with twin wall acrylic sheet. This is unacceptable in the context of the Listed Building and the roof should be glazed with glass. The rooflight is too shallow a pitch and the hip ends are not the same slope as the sides. The module of the glazing is too wide in the context of the Listed Building. Suggested changes include:
 - Confirm roof is to be glazed with glass
 - Reduce glazing bar module to 600mm
 - Increase roof pitch
 - Hip ends and sides to be the same pitch
 - Confirm the use of plain ridges and hips, not decorative finials

Comments on the latest submission:

Whilst the latest addition information has responded in part to previous comments on the proposals, the general level of information presented is very sketchy and in particular fails to illustrate the proposed extension in the context of the building as a whole, something that is required as a part of any application affecting a Grade II building. There are no overall elevations (there’s a need for a side elevation to The Leas and a rear elevation). There is also very little information about the interior and no photos, so it is not possible to assess the impact of the interior design. We have mentioned this at all of the previous meetings

and comments.

The design drawings do show positive changes to the design including the following:

1. **David Thomas drawing PG04** – amendments to show a corner post rather than a brick pier, with a set of four opening French doors, with side lights to either end. This is an improvement on the original scheme which looked like a commercial shopfront in a modern shopping arcade. However I feel there is a need for yet more amendments to the design before it reaches the minimum standard that might be acceptable in the context of the Grade II main building
2. **David Thomas drawing PG02/Elephant Windows Roof Plan** – The roof plan also shows a greater number of patent glazing bars set out in a more logical arrangement – this is also an improvement on the original scheme where the glazing bars were very widely spaced.
3. **Outstanding Interiors drawing 07** – This shows the internal layout and arrangement of all the interior basement rooms of the restaurant – see general comment above:
4. **3D Image** – This simply shows the changes described above and warrants no extra comment.
5. **Side Casements and Front Doors**– This drawing shows the arrangement very much as before. The design still shows differing pane sizes between the fixed lights and the casements. This creates a very irregular arrangement. As before, my recommendation is that the design should be amended to include dummy casements in the fixed lights, so that all the window panes are the same size – giving a regular appearance. The design with (presumably) white colour-coated Aluminium window sections suffers from having a very flat- 2-dimensional appearance to the window set and this would benefit from the introduction of box section pilasters into the design. Perhaps every other window post- but this would require there to be 6 casements rather than 5.

The same applies to the front elevation where the side panels glazing differs from that in the doors and there is still no modelling of the façade to include more substantial pilasters (as discussed previously). This results in an unfortunate flat appearance especially at the corners where the brick plinth at the side terminates at the corner in an unresolved way. A worthwhile amendment might be to return the brick plinth around the corner to extend as far as the doorset, with a matching panel on the right-hand side. (see attached sketch)

6. **Glazing Bar Details and Photo of Roof Bar** – This is a well-designed detail which creates an external glazing bar appearance not unlike a traditional patent glazing bar – and is acceptable
7. **Gutter Detail** – This shows a very ill-defined ogee pattern plastic gutter which looks very '*jelly mould plasticky*' and not really appropriate for use on a grade II building

Recommendations:

Even with this additional information, the application documents still contain insufficient information – appropriate to a proposal for an extension to a Listed Building. Whilst the design of the extension is now shown sufficient to describe it, there is no information to show the effect of the proposal in the context of the building as a whole, nor to enable us to assess the impact on the interiors. There are also no drawings showing what is proposed outside the extension - in the courtyard between it and the street, and whether there are changes proposed to the front boundary wall, planting etc. is there to be a disabled access ramp for example?) There is no adequate heritage impact assessment.

The design has moved on from the original very banal shopfront-like scheme but the scheme is still a very basic conservatory and the detailing of the front doorset and, in particular, the side window is not of an acceptable standard for an extension to a Grade II Listed building of this quality. Whilst colour-coated aluminium may well be acceptable in principle, the detailing needs to be of a higher quality than shown here. I refer to the need for pilasters to modulate the front entrance screen, the need for dummy

casements and pilasters to the side window and the need for a properly detailed eaves cornice gutter, which could be an extruded section aluminium ogee gutter , provided the detailed profile is properly and crisply formed

We also need the extra information on the impact of the interior design works and information on the treatment of the forecourt areas and boundary to The Leas as a part of the application.

These points have all been raised with the applicant on more than one occasion previously