

Ref: DM/26/1460 and DM/26/1461

OBJECTIONS:

1. New Wall and Air Source Heat Pump (ASHP)

(See Gould Baxter drawing PL002 dated 22/07/2026)

The proposed new wall and the ASHP to the left of the drawing seems to contravene a Covenant dated 05/02/2002 between Sundial Cottage, Mulberry Cottage and White Lodge “not to erect any building or structure of any description on that part of the courtyard”. It is clear that at that time, the owners of Mulberry Cottage, Sundial Cottage and White Lodge acted together to preserve the open nature of the courtyard in perpetuity.

Additionally, the ASHP will be unsightly and emanate noise, which is unacceptable to Sundial Cottage and White Lodge residents.

2. Building of new Wall

The drawing on page 1 of the ‘Heritage Statement’ (titled ‘location of Mulberry Cottage’) shows barriers/walls at either end of the courtyard and contradicts the ‘Heritage Statement’ 7-18 “Furthermore, the proposal would not see the division of the courtyard space, which runs south of Mulberry Cottage and Sundial Cottage and west of White Lodge. There are already planters in place that form a divide – see photo on Page 2 of the Heritage Statement. Finally, these planters impede our **right of way** along the whole of the courtyard and need to be removed.

3. Original Design Intent

The building of a wall where the metal gates are currently installed and the ripping up and removing half of the herringbone brickwork and replacing it with lawn totally ruins the integral vista along the courtyard. This can be seen from the attached photos from the last sale particulars from Mulberry Cottage (below left) and from recent sale particulars from White Lodge (below right).



4. **Removal of a Section of Herringbone paving to Create a Lawn Area**

7.16 states that “this introduces a more domestic quality to part of the garden”. This courtyard is not a garden. It is part of a shared courtyard space.

7.17 We cannot agree with this statement. The proposal is not peripheral, it is central and an integral part of the service courtyard.

7.18 Adding a lawn area ruins the reading of the historic yard surface and its role as an operational working space.

7.19 The resulting impact is extremely high and certainly harms the significance of the stable range and the wider Old Place setting. It is not reversible – the bricks will not be retained, and a domestic introduction will in itself attract the detritus of everyday life. It is not and never has been intended as a domestic setting and once changed will never be reversed. There is no reason to “soften the landscaping or provide a contrast to the extensive brick paving around the property” (Gould Baxter 6.1).

Furthermore, there is nothing in the planning application as to how the proposed lawn area would meet the paviers on our joint boundary.

7.25 This is an incorrect statement. There would be a large loss of paving and the ability to understand the open aspect of the space and the connection of the former stable block with the other structures associated with Old Place, would be lost.

Significance

5.17 This should read.....Mulberry Cottage **and its cojoined courtyard with Sundial Cottage and White Lodge must be viewed as a group.** Their value with Old Place (Grade II*), the studio pavilion and estate gates is high, forming an integral part of a coherent designed landscape.

5.18 This should read.... The survival of the external envelope and its existing paviers, reinstated with its original, uninterrupted view, will continue to provide valuable insights into the architectural character, evolution and social history of the Old Place estate.

6.23 We agree that the “surviving features....brick paviers in herringbone bond.....contribute positively to its setting and ability to communicate significance”.

