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1.0 Historic Building Analysis & Advice

1.1 Introduction

This report was commissioned in January 2014 by the Royal Bank of Scotland, to assist with proposals for the conversion of Bryn Hafod and Middlewest into apartments, the refurbishment of Bryn Hafod Cottage and Middlewest Cottage for use as single family dwellings, and the demolition of the 1960s chapel connected to Bryn Hafod. The investigation and this report were undertaken by Ashleigh Murray and Helen Ensor of Donald Insall Associates Ltd in February 2014.

The study has comprised historical research using both archival and secondary material and site inspections. An illustrated history of the building and site, together with sources of reference and bibliography, is in section 2; the site survey findings are in Section 3. The investigation has established the architectural and historical significance of the buildings, which is set out in Section 1.3 below. When the scheme is finalised, Section 4 will provide a justification of the scheme according to the relevant local and national planning policies and guidance.

1.2 Legislative Background

The site consists of two Grade II-listed buildings, Bryn Hafod and Middlewest, and their associated cottages which are within the curtilage of both listed buildings and therefore also protected. Bryn Hafod was designed by the architect John Alfred Gotch (1852-1942) at the turn of the 20th century. Middlewest was previously attributed to Gotch but it has now been reattributed to one A. Bamford. Both houses were originally constructed as single family dwellings. A chapel constructed in 1963 is also attached to Bryn Hafod. The site is located in Kettering but does not fall within the boundaries of a conservation area.

Alterations to listed buildings and proposals which affect structures (built before 1st July 1948) within the curtilage of listed buildings require Listed Building Consent. In order for Kettering Borough Council to grant such consent, the proposals must be justified according to the policies on the historic environment set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. Copies of the relevant planning policy documents are included in Appendix I and the statutory list description in Appendix II.

The key message of the NPPF is the concept of ‘sustainable development’, which applies to existing ‘heritage assets’ (a term that, with regard to UK planning legislation, includes listed buildings, Conservation Areas, unlisted buildings of local importance and historic parks and gardens) as well as new developments.

The NPPF requires that heritage assets should be conserved in a manner ‘appropriate to their significance’.¹ It also notes the desirability of ‘sustaining and enhancing the significance’ of heritage assets and of putting assets to viable uses ‘consistent with their conservation.’²

---

¹ NPPF 2012, Paragraph 17
² NPPF, 2012, Clause 131
The NPPF recognises the ‘positive contribution of that the conservation of heritage assets can make towards economic vitality’. However, it also recognises that, in some cases, proposals can lead to a heritage asset losing significance. The NPPF thus requires that the ‘public benefits of a proposal’ - which includes securing its optimum viable use - should outweigh any ‘less than substantial’ harm caused to the significance of a designated heritage asset. Kettering Borough Council will, therefore, expect any Listed Building Consent application to include an assessment of the significance of the building and an explanation of any potential scheme’s impact on that significance. Ultimately, this report will provide both.

1.3 Summary of Significance

The key areas of heritage significance are as follows:

Bryn Hafod
- Intact building of the late 19th century
- By J A Gotch, the foremost architect of the local area, whose importance extends much further than the relatively small geographical area in which most of his works were executed. Built for Charles Wicksteed, an important Northamptonshire figure.
- Characteristic use of red brick with stone dressings. All details of exceptionally high quality and finish.
- Gabled silhouette and inclusion of typical ‘Gotch details’ such as ‘Gotch windows’, leaded glass, door surrounds.
- Quality and commitment to the design carried through to the (almost unaltered) interior where even the smallest details appear to have been architect-designed.
- Staircase and stairhall screen particularly fine but all principal rooms and much of the unaltered family rooms are of significance.
- Plan form on the ground floor (excluding later alterations) and some of the first floor.

Middlewest
- Intact building of the early 20th century
- Whilst the attribution is uncertain, there are a number of features which strongly suggest the involvement of J A Gotch (see detailed analysis below). Either way, the design both externally and internally is assured, educated and entirely coherent.
- Characteristic use of red brick with stone dressings, but here augmented with roughcast render perhaps reflecting the difference in age of the two buildings (and the difference in means of the two clients?). Detailing of high quality.
- Inclusion of some ‘Gotch-esque’ features such as the external door surrounds and internally the screened bay windows and plan form.
- Quality and commitment to the design carried through to the (largely unaltered) interior, where even the smallest details appear to have been bespoke designed.
- Staircase and stairhall particularly fine but all principal rooms are of significance.
- Plan form on the ground floor (excluding later alterations) and some elements of the first floor plan are also of significance.

Cottages
- The cottages to both buildings are covered by the statutory listings as ‘curtilage structures’.
- They appear to have been designed by the same hand and have almost identical plans forms. Middlewest, in particular, has the characteristic Gotch detail where the
stone string course at first floor forms an ‘O’ shape to accept and encircle the
downpipe.

- Characteristic use of red brick with (simplified) stone dressings.
- Social/ historic connection to original use of the main houses as on-site employee
  accommodation. Physical relationship to the main houses and complimentary
  appearances.

There are areas which detract from the significance of the buildings:

**Bryn Hafod**

- The 1960s chapel and link structure. This obscures the otherwise handsome side
elevation of the building and prevents the house from being viewed ‘in the round’ as
was the architect’s intention. The link is in a state of advanced dereliction and was
never a quality structure. The chapel is, perhaps, not without social interest as an
intervention by the nuns who occupied the site in the later 20th-century and who
chose to use the successor practice to J A Gotch, Gotch, Saunders and Surridge.
However, in terms of impact on the main listed building, the chapel is not a success.
Its grey bricks (which do not look well against the warm red bricks of the house) and
vertical slot windows, height, bulk and flat roof contrast jarringly with the qualities of
the main listed building. Its removal would certainly bring about heritage benefits and
would help to reveal the heritage significance of the site, by allowing the building to
be viewed in its proper setting and removing that which obscures the side elevation
and door.
- The poor state of repair. Whilst the current owners have worked hard to ensure that
the buildings were made weathertight, the many years prior to this where water
poured through the building brought about inevitable deterioration. A sustainable new
use is urgently required, not just for the sake of the listed building but also for the
sake of those who live near the site.
- The apparent theft of architectural features such as chimneypieces, many of which
have been removed since DIA’s last survey in 2007.
- The overgrown and dilapidated landscape setting. Restoring the terrace and a
garden setting to the building would enhance its heritage significance.
- The gaping hole left by the implementation of an earlier permission to demolish
extensions built under the ownership of the Covent.

**Middlewest**

- The poor state of repair. Whilst the current owners have worked hard to ensure that
the buildings were made weathertight, the many years prior to this where water
poured through the building brought about inevitable deterioration. A sustainable new
use is urgently required, not just for the sake of the listed building but doubtless also
for the sake of those who live near the site.
- The overgrown and dilapidated landscape setting. Restoring the terrace and a
garden setting to the building would aid the understanding of its heritage significance.
- The alterations to the plan form, especially on the first floor, to accommodate school
use. This has resulted in large open plan spaces and the loss of understanding of
how the upper floor of the house functioned in the early 20th century.
- The apparent theft of architectural features such as chimneypieces, many of which
have been removed since DIA’s last survey in 2007.
The small single storey extension on the north elevation which has an awkward appearance, albeit that it seems to date from before 1922.

Cottages
- Their poor state of repair and the impact this has on the setting of the two main listed buildings.

1.4 Summary of Proposals and Justification

To be done
2.0 Historical Background

2.1 Development of Kettering

The civil and urban district of Kettering covers 2,814 acres and the town occupies the greater part of this area, standing on high ground.\(^3\)

In 1227 the town was granted a market charter, and farming long remained its most common form of employment.\(^4\) In 1720 Kettering was a large town ‘containing five hundred sixty houses’\(^5\). By the mid-18\(^{th}\) century it had a reputation for woolen manufacture, although this declined by the end of the century.\(^6\) In 1786 Thomas Gotch (1748-1806) opened the first factory in the town for the manufacture of boots and shoes, which was an industry that became the town’s main trade; by 1831 one man in three was engaged in the trade.\(^7\) The Gotch family was intimately associated with Kettering for about 150 years and were also responsible for creating the first bank in the town (see 2.2).

Kettering rose in prosperity and importance during the late Victorian and Edwardian periods and most historic buildings date from these periods. In 1857 the railway was opened and during the 1860s the town expanded to the north and east. The boot and shoe industry flourished and many factories were built during the late 19\(^{th}\) century. Chapels and churches were also constructed, in addition to several public buildings, including the Public Library designed by Goddard & Co of Leicester in 1904. The most important architect in the area during this time was John Alfred Gotch (1852-1942), great-grandson of the shoe manufacturer, Thomas Gotch.\(^8\)

2.2 The Gotch Dynasty

Roy Hargraves, in his thesis about the life and works of John Alfred Gotch, reveals the history of the Gotch family and its significance to the town of Kettering. Thomas Gotch (1748-1806) became Kettering’s principal employer through his boot and shoe firm. He was also one of the first bankers in the town.\(^9\)

At the age of twelve Thomas Gotch was apprenticed to his father, a shoe maker. In 1786, Gotch formed a partnership with James Cobb and set up boot and shoe manufacturing business. Cobb, in turn, was responsible for Gotch’s association with banking. The Kettering bank was one of the numerous country banks which were founded between 1789 and 1793. The partners were Cobb, Burton and Thomas Keep and in 1790 Thomas Gotch joined the partnership. Gotch’s shoe business expanded in 1793 and it was most likely funded by the bank.\(^10\)

\(^3\) Page, W., A History of the County of Northampton: Volume 3, p. 218
\(^6\) Pevsner, Northamptonshire, p. 354-6
\(^7\) Hargraves, John Alfred Gotch, p. 45
\(^8\) Pevsner, Northamptonshire, p. 356
\(^9\) Hargraves, John Alfred Gotch
\(^10\) Hargraves, John Alfred Gotch, pp. 27-31
When Thomas Gotch died in 1806 the business was taken over by his son John Cooper Gotch, who had followed his father into the shoe trade from an early age. The shoe manufacturing business flourished and it was involved in many military contracts; in the first half of 1813 it supplied 133,000 pairs of shoes to the Royal Navy, for example. Like his father, Gotch too engaged in the banking business. At his death in 1852 the Baptist magazine wrote that he was ‘universally respected in the town, and ready at all times, to assist everyone who sought his advice or help, he took a very leading part in the political affairs of the county, and was thoroughly trusted by all leaders of the Liberal party.’\textsuperscript{11} It also notes that he had been a deacon to the Baptist church. He left both thriving businesses and all stocks and shares to his two sons, John Davis (1802-70) and Thomas Henry (1804-91).\textsuperscript{12}

John Davis assumed responsibility for the shoe business and Thomas Henry conducted the affairs of the bank, which was struggling financially. In 1857 the bank had to close its doors, at a time when other banks also shut. In order to pay their creditors, the brother’s property and possessions had to be sold. Real estate represented the largest part of the Gotch family’s seventy five years of work and this was divided into ten lots and auctioned in 1858. Subsequently, the brothers set out rebuilding their lives. John Davis stayed in Kettering and rebuilt and restored the family name and shoe business. Thomas Henry moved to London but returned in 1862 to help his brother with the family business.\textsuperscript{13}

The collapse of the Gotch empire provided an opportunity for the people of Kettering. Many past employees of the Gotch family started their own businesses. Gaps in the chain supply needed to be filled and also there was no longer a reluctance to approach a banker who might discourage the establishment of other shoe businesses. William Hanger set up his business in a disused silk factory and by 1871 he was the second largest employer in the town. However, the formation of other businesses did not affect the re-established Gotch business who continued to win in military contracts and, once again, became the largest employer in the town. By 1888, however, their shoe manufactory closed, although Thomas Henry’s two sons remained in the industry.\textsuperscript{14}

\textbf{2.3 John Alfred Gotch (1852-1952)}

John Alfred Gotch was the leading architect in Kettering in the late 19\textsuperscript{th}/early 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries [Plate 1]. He was born in Kettering on the 28\textsuperscript{th} September 1852, the third son of Thomas Henry Gotch and Mary Anne Gotch, and was one of four brothers [Plate 2]. The eldest brother, Henry Gale Gotch (1848-1939), assisted his father in the shoe business and in 1900 he became director of the shoe manufacturer, Merrs. Mobbs and Lewis Ltd. He was also involved in education and worked with the Kettering British School and was Chairman of the Governors of both the old and new Grammar Schools. Davis Fredric Gotch (1850-1935) spent some time in the shoe trade before entering into partnership with another shoe manufacturer, William Timspon. After eight years he retired due to ill health. He was also involved in education and became Organising Inspector under the Education Committee of the Northamptonshire County Council. Thomas Cooper Gotch (1854-1931) was the youngest brother and he was a noted figure painter and a member of the Royal Academy. A

\begin{footnotes}
\item[12] Hargraves, \textit{John Alfred Gotch}, pp. 44-57
\item[13] Ibid, pp. 59-65
\item[14] Ibid, pp. 69-71
\end{footnotes}
considerable number of his paintings form part of the permanent collection of the Alfred East Gallery in Kettering, which was designed by John Alfred Gotch.\(^{15}\)

John Alfred Gotch attended Kettering Grammar School and later studied at the University of Zurich, before starting his architectural training at King’s College, London. In February 1871, he was articled to Robert Winter Johnson (1832-1884), architect and surveyor, of Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire. Johnson was surveyor to Melton Mowbray and the Kettering Local Boards. Gotch was dispatched to Melton where he lived for about three or four years.\(^{16}\)

At an unknown date, Gotch went to Manchester to join architects James Medland Taylor (1834-1909) and Henry Taylor and then, subsequently, moved to London where he worked with his uncle, Joseph Gale (1830-1906), at his office in Bermondsey, dealing mostly with tanneries. In 1879 Gotch returned to Kettering and set up his own practice in the town. His business did well but he realised that in order for it to fully flourish a partnership would be necessary. Charles Saunders (1858-1944) had, like Gotch, worked with Robert Winter Johnson and upon his employer's death in 1884 he took over Johnson’s Kettering business. On the 1\(^{st}\) March 1887 the firm Gotch and Saunders was created. Their business flourished and by 1890 their partnership had been consolidated by support from influential clients such as the Duke of Buccleuch and Stopford Sackville.\(^{17}\)

During their partnership, they only invited three other architects to the firm. Arthur George Leighton (1867-1943) joined in 1891 and was a partner between 1897 and 1915. His responsibilities largely related to a subsidiary practice in London, Messrs. Gale, Gotch and Leighton. John Alfred's nephew, Laurence Gotch (1881-1964) was articled to the practice in 1898 but he left to become second assistant to A. N. Prentice. Later in life, he re-joined Gotch and Saunders, becoming junior partner in 1919. The most important architect that was employed was Henry Ralph Surridge (1885-1954) who joined the firm as an office junior in 1899 and became partner in 1930. The business then took on the name that it has kept to this day: Gotch, Saunders and Surridge. This company still operates in Kettering, with additional offices in Bristol and Harrogate.\(^{18}\)

From late 19\(^{th}\) century, the practice flourished with the rapid growth of Kettering, as the town was transformed from a small market town into a thriving industrial centre. Gotch had four particular areas of activity which were: the town of Kettering; schools; banks; and country houses.

Kettering is often referred to as ‘the town that Gotch built’, because he designed a whole host of building types in the town, including houses, hospitals, banks, offices, shops, working men’s clubs, factories and warehouses. He was also responsible for Wicksteed Park, the Alfred Art Gallery and the Victoria Hall.\(^{19}\) Between 1891 and 1937, Gotch was involved in 49 school buildings, of which 29 were sizeable undertakings centred on Northamptonshire and Bedfordshire. The practice was also highly involved with the Midland Bank (now HSBC), undertaking 140 branch building projects nationwide. Gotch’s most important commission was

---

\(^{15}\) Hargraves, *John Alfred Gotch*, pp. 84-86 and *Kettering Leader & Guardian*, 1942

\(^{16}\) MacAlister, I., *Gotch, John Alfred* (1852–1942), 2004

\(^{17}\) Hargraves, *John Alfred Gotch*, pp. 74-78

\(^{18}\) Ibid, p. 80 and http://www.gssarchitecture.com/

\(^{19}\) Hargraves, *John Alfred Gotch*, p. 94
his work with Sir Edwin Lutyens for the Headquarters of the London City and Midland Bank, 27-32 Poultry, London, EC2. Gotch was also involved in many building and restoration works for the country houses of his aristocratic clients, including Euston Hall, Clopton Manor House, Thornby Grange and Corby House.  

Gotch was active in Northamptonshire politics; he was a member of the County Council, became a County Magistrate in 1893 and was also the first chairman of the Kettering Liberal Association. In 1938, when Kettering became a borough, Gotch was accorded the highest honour the town could give when he was appointed Charter Mayor. During the First World War he was Livestock Sub-Commissioner for the District and was the Assistant Representative for the Kettering Sub-Area of the 48th Regimental district recruiting area. He was also Chairman of the Northamptonshire Records Association for seventeen years.

In his work for the architectural profession, Gotch was president of the Architectural Association in 1886-7 and was a member of the Royal Institute of British Architects for nearly forty years, and its president in 1923-5, notably the first architect from outside London to serve in this position.


The *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* notes that Gotch’s writings bear the imprint of his character, which was one of extreme simplicity and solidity. His speech was direct, almost blunt, but it was tempered by a keen sense of humour, a courteous manner and a natural dignity. Gotch was only interested in working in past styles and his great knowledge and admiration for the periods with which he worked with meant he had no time for modern trends and made no attempt to understand them. In particular, he loved the building crafts of earlier ages and used these in his designs.

In January 1942, Gotch fell ill to bronchial pneumonia and died at his home, Weekley Rise, Weekley, near Kettering. He is buried in Weekley churchyard, beneath a plain gravestone which is ‘characteristic of the simplicity of the man’.  

---

20 Ibid pp. 94-95  
22 MacAlister, I., Gotch, John Alfred (1852–1942), 2004  
23 Ibid  
24 Hargraves, *John Alfred Gotch*, p. 91
2.4 Site History

An archaeological report by Northamptonshire County Council from 2003, which provided an assessment and building evaluation of the site, reveals the historical development of the land.

In 1547 the site of the two main houses was open pasture, known as Hall Middle Field. By 1728 Hall Middle Field was divided into three parts, the larger part, called Horse Close, contained the land of the site. This land belonged to the Duke of Buccleuch and was divided between four tenants: Hech, Lackburn, Deerson and Roberts. By 1804 Horse Close was divided into five parts known as Horse Closes.25

Several land transfers of land adjoining Hall Lane are recorded during the early 19th century but none describe the sites of the two houses in detail. The most interesting is a deed of 1833 which describes the break-up of land adjoining Hall Lane belonging to William Roughton the Elder. One of the people that the land transferred to was John Cooper Gotch, a banker who was presumably a relation of John Alfred Gotch.26

By the end of the 19th century, this area became an ideal location for exclusive large houses. The first to be built, south of Northampton Road, was Elm Bank which was designed by John Alfred Gotch in 1892-6 for William Raby Thorpe (c. 1832-1896), a local shoe and boot manufacturer.27 Gotch also designed two other large houses south of Elm Bank, namely Middlewest and Bryn Hafod, the subjects of this report.

2.5 Bryn Hafod

Bryn Hafod was designed in 1896 by J. A. Gotch for Charles Wicksteed (1847-1931), a manufacturer of steam ploughs since 1876 [Plate 3a-b].

2.5.1 Charles Wicksteed (1847-1931)

Charles Wicksteed was born in 1847 in Leeds [Plate 4]. When he was young, due to the deterioration of his father’s health, the family moved to a farm called Hafod-y-Coed in the Vale of Clywd in Wales. When Wicksteed was sixteen he was apprenticed to the famous engineering firm of Kitson and Hewetson of Leeds, manufacturer of railway and steam tram engines. Wicksteed eventually acquired a steam plough manufacturing business and, after a period in East Anglia, moved his workshop to Kettering.

As Kettering was, at the time, enjoying its extraordinary industrial boom Wicksteed’s business soon flourished. He patented many gadgets and improvements and the firm was highly successful, enabling him to devote his time to local good causes – such as holding posts in the Urban District Council and Board of Guardians, and supporting local liberal politics. Near to the end of his life, Wicksteed wanted to present something to the people of Kettering. He created a public park, Wicksteed Park, which was lavishly laid out in 1921 on the edge of Kettering’s south eastern suburbs, to designs by Gotch. Wicksteed went on to become a manufacturer of children’s play equipment, initially for this park with the manufacture of the

25 Northamptonshire County Council, Archaeological Desk Based Assessment & Building Evaluation, 2003
26 Ibid
very first swing and slide in the UK. His company still exists today as manufacturers of children’s play equipment.28

When Wicksteed first moved to Kettering, he and his wife lived in a small house in Silver Street. Later, he decided to build his own house, one that would be large and convenient enough to allow his mother to spend a lot of time there. He chose a site to the west of Kettering, on a hill overlooking the town. There was some debate about the house’s name but eventually Bryn Hafod was chosen. It means hill summer abode and is a variation of Hafod-y-Coed (summer abode in the wood), the name of his childhood home.29

2.5.2 History of Bryn Hafod

According to the biography on Wicksteed by his daughter, the house was built between 1896 and 1898. Wicksteed’s initials (CW) and the year 1898 are carved into an area of stonework on the exterior of the building, demonstrating that the house was completed by this time [Plate 5]. Wicksteed had firm views on the building’s design: ‘The house must be built with a central hall, easily cleared for dancing; there must be space for entertaining and several spare rooms for guests.’30 Hargraves records that the total cost of building was £3,360.31 In 1923, an article in the Northamptonshire Evening Telegraph revealed that Wicksteed found it ‘a beautiful house, which had never been altered or repaired and was comfortable and beautiful in every way. Everything Mr. Gotch did was tasteful, beautiful, and good work’.32

The house was reviewed in The Builder on the 24th August 1901, thus signifying its importance. The description of the house notes that it was by Gotch and Saunders and that the contractor was George Hewson of Wellingborough, the leaded lights by George Wragge and the ceilings by Messrs Shuffrey & Co of London.33

George Wragge (b 1863) was a noted craftsman who specialised in stained glass, leaded lights, mosaic, door furniture, electrical fittings and metal plaques. His firm operated workshops in Manchester with branches in London and Glasgow. The firm’s main work was metal casements and door furniture but it was also noted for its production of designer Arts and Crafts fittings, including some work for the architect Edgar Wood (1860-1935).34

Wicksteed also had clear views on the garden that he wanted, as reported by his daughter:

He chose a site of two to three acres to the west of Kettering, so to it that it included a spring of water, that it was on a slope, and that it contained fine trees; and then, pinning paper to his drawing-board, he began his plan. A lawn, a sunk wall, another lawn, a pond (the spring must form a pond, for he must always have water). And at the pond’s side there must be a summer-house, from which one could bathe in summer; and in the summer-house there

---

28 Wicksteed, H., Charles Wicksteed, 1933
29 Ibid p 66, 78
30 Ibid p.78
31 Hargraves, John Alfred Gotch, p. 105
32 Northamptonshire Evening Telegraph, 12 December 1923 (quote taken from Hargraves thesis p 105)
33 The Builder, 24 August 1901, p. 176
must be a fire, by which one could warm oneself when skating in winter. One thing, above all else, was important – there should be a terrace, broad and flat, no steps, and no slopes, in front of the house, on which his mother and all old people after her might walk when their powers failed them for more hazardous journeys. When the garden was finished, grown, and beautiful, he would open it to the public on Sundays, as his relatives around Leeds had opened their grounds, that others might share their enjoyment and he would place it at the disposal of all who asked for the loan.35

The Ordnance Survey map of 1900 shows that the garden was laid out to Wicksteed’s wishes [Plate 6]. This map also shows that there was a small separate structure to the north of the main house, which was enlarged by 1926 [Plate 7]. A plan of the house in the Builder in 1901 shows that this originally contained three rooms which consisted of a coals and wood room, a dynamo house and a bicycle house [Plate 8]. The ground floor was extended by 1926 to include a garage. This now has an additional floor and connects with the main house at first floor level. These changes were likely to have taken place in 1966 (see 2.5.3).

In Tony Smith’s book on Kettering, entitled Fred Moore’s Kettering, he records that when Wicksteed died in 1931 the house was rented by a Mr Mitchell, who was a manager at Stewarts and Lloyds in Corby. He notes that in 1936 it became the Convent of Our Lady, for the Congregation of the Sisters of Our Lady, and at this time the house next door, Middlewest, was set up as a preparatory school by the Ursuline Sisters.36 In contrast to this, the Northamptonshire archaeological report notes that the land of Bryn Hafod was first acquired by the Ursuline Sisters in 1938-9 and was purchased by the Sisters of Our Lady in 1954.37 Whichever account is correct, it is clear that the house was used for religious purposes by the end of the 1930s and that, together with Middlewest, it was certainly owned by the Sisters of Our Lady by 1954.

Smith explains that the Sisters of Our Lady, known nationally as the Sisters of Notre Dame, is a worldwide apostolic institute whose mother house is in Rome. It is an organisation that lives by strict vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. The Sisters left Bryn Hafod by 2003.38

2.5.3 The Chapel

During the Sisters’ occupation of Bryn Hafod, they carried out many changes to the house. Planning records show that in 1963 they built a chapel to the south which was designed by Gotch, Saunders and Surridge. The chapel was connected to the main house by means of an enclosed link. This link involved the creation of a new door in the southern elevation of Bryn Hafod and the introduction of a partition wall within its Drawing Room (G6) so that a corridor connected with the main hall (G4) [Plate 9]. The chapel was altered in 1995. Internally, the architect B. D. Kaye designed a new curved plaster ceiling, installed a decorative hardwood panel to the rear of the room and introduced suspended light fittings. Kaye also designed three new windows for both the west and east elevations. A fire escape door and ramp were also introduced to the north at this time. This proposal also involved the erection of a free standing car port.

35 Ibid p. 76
36 Smith, T., Fred Moore’s Kettering, Northamtonshire: 2003, p. 120
37 Northamptonshire County Council, 2003, p. 7
38 Smith, Fred Moore’s Kettering, p. 120
2.5.4 Further Alterations and Extensions to Bryn Hafod

In 1966, to the north of Bryn Hafod, the Sisters added another extension which contained bedrooms, toilets, sick bays, dormitories, study rooms, a refectory room, a common room and a sewing room. This extension was also designed by Gotch, Saunders and Surridge. It may be assumed that the second floor of the early 20th century structure (to the north of the house) [Plate 10] and the link at first floor level connecting it with the main building were added at this time, as well as the external passage at ground floor level. In recent years, this large extension has been demolished, although relics of the structure are still present and a large gaping hole exists, exposing the first floor level to the elements [Plate 10].

In 1989, planning records show that further alterations took place at Bryn Hafod. Whilst most of these changes related to the 1960s extension, it was at this time that fire screens were added to both stairwells at first floor level within the main house.

Although changes took place at the house, the plan form of the building has largely remained intact. A plan in The Builder depicts the layout of the ground floor in 1901 [Plate 8] which may be compared to the current ground floor plan [Appendix III]. The main difference is the loss of a wall separating the china closet (G10) from the kitchen (G11) and the blocking up of the original door of the china closet. The historic plan shows that windows have been added in the scullery (G13) and the wash kitchen (G15). It also depicts how the drawing room (G6) functioned before the partition and door were added in 1963.

2.5.5 Bryn Hafod Cottage

No records survive which relate to the history of Bryn Hafod Cottage. It can be assumed that the cottage is of the same date as Bryn Hafod as it appears for the first time on the same edition of the Ordnance Survey map and was clearly designed as its attendant building [Plate 11]. It is of a simple plan form with three rooms on both ground and first floors and with a central single flight stairway – much like that at Middlewest. Its front door (and main front) faces south, rather than onto the road, leaving a gable and blank side wall addressing Hall Lane.

2.6 Middlewest

The history of Middlewest is complicated as little archival information survives to confirm who it was designed by and when it was built [Plate 12]. An assessment of the different sources is dealt with in the section below.

2.6.1 Who Designed Middlewest?

The original list description for Middlewest of 1977, since updated, described it thus: ‘1900 by J A Gotch. Red brick and pebbledash, tiled roof. L plan of varied outline. 2 storeys and attics, sash and casement windows.’ It is curious that Bryn Hafod was not also listed at this time. Although both houses are accomplished and confident designs, Bryn Hafod is a finer house with more architectural detailing. In Hargraves’ thesis he describes typical Gotch style details, which include multiple gables; three-centred and semi-circular arches; strapwork; pilasters; orbs and finials; balustrades; stone dressings; conspicuous chimney stacks; and ‘Gotch’ style
windows which consist of a semi-circular arch within a central light, thereby producing two glazed spandrels.\(^\text{39}\) Bryn Hafod clearly displays more of these features than Middlwest. The fact that Bryn Hafod was overlooked at this time is strange; Bryn Hafod was eventually listed in 2004.

In the updated version of Pevsner (2013), both Middlwest and Bryn Hafod are noted as being by Gotch (previously Bryn Hafod was not commented upon). However, the current list description (which was most likely updated in 2004 when Bryn Hafod was listed) states that Middlwest was by A. Bamford for a Mr. Berrill. At the end of the list description is says that this information came from Hargraves, who is the leading authority on Gotch; ‘pers. comm. from RK Hargrave re attribution to Bamford’.

This attribution to Bamford is somewhat confusing. First, no information can be found about an architect by the name of A. Bamford. Moreover, as part of Hargraves thesis, is a chronological list of all Gotch’s works mainly taken from work ledgers belonging to Gotch. There is an entry for a building on the Northampton Road built in 1903 for an F. Berrill at a cost of £1,860 (ledger ref: 2/108, 165). It notes that Gotch was responsible for plans, specifications and superintending the execution. A. Bamford is mentioned but is referred to as the builder, rather than the designer.

Furthermore, there are many Gotch-esque details found within Middlwest. The eastern entrance doors on both Middlwest and Bryn Hafod are very similar in design; an arched door head with a fanlight above divided by a stone mullion, with flanking mullioned and transomed windows [Plate 13 & 14]. In both buildings, canted bay windows are located either side of the eastern entrance [Plate 15 & 16]. Also of similarity is the treatment of rainwater down pipes. Within the stone band at first floor level at Bryn Hafod, a curved section has been carved to allow the pipe to pass through it. This feature can also be found on Middlwest Cottage [Plate 17], an attendant building to Middlwest, and also on Elm Bank, another Gotch building [Plate 18].

The plan forms of Middlwest and Bryn Hafod also have strong similarities [Appendix III]. Both have a main staircase with a large central hall and an entrance facing east opening directly out to garden terraces. Each also has a secondary entrance and corridor that leads to service areas which housed cloakrooms and WCs. In each house these corridors have terrazzo floor coverings. To the rear of the main staircases, the stairwells and halls can be accessed from these service areas. The use of leaded casement windows for rooms for show and sash windows for more utilitarian rooms can be also found at both buildings.

Gotch uses arched decorative timber screens throughout Bryn Hafod, in particular for framing the canted bay windows in the main rooms at ground floor level [Plate 38 & 40]. Within Middlwest, an arched screen also frames the canted bay window in the main dining room (G8) [Plate 52]. Also at Middlwest, a chimneypiece at second floor level has a central corbel-like feature [Plate 60] which can be found on other Gotch properties.

Middlwest Cottage was built as an attendant building to Middlwest. Here too we can see similarities between this cottage and the cottage connected with Bryn Hafod. The plan forms of Bryn Hafod Cottage and Middlwest Cottage are almost identical; both are L-shaped in

\(^{39}\) Hargraves, John Alfred Gotch, pp. 97-98
plan and have a central door with a central tight straight-flight staircase with main rooms either side on both levels (see Appendix III).

Although the main house (Middlewest) has now been attributed to Bamford, the citing of him within Hargraves thesis as a builder leads one to wonder if Bamford was in fact the builder and Gotch was the architect. The alternative conclusion is that Bamford was a skilful architect who took reference from Gotch. In either case, Middlewest can be seen to be a fine example of an early 20th century residential property with an abundance of distinguished original features.

### 2.6.2 History of Middlewest

Middlewest does not appear on the Ordnance Survey map of 1900 [Plate 6] but it is illustrated on the 1926 OS map [Plate 7]. The house was previously called Gildenburgh but the OS map shows that by 1926 it was referred to as Middlewest. As previously discussed, it was most likely built in 1903 for an F. Berrill. Local directories list an Oscar Neal at the house in 1910. By 1915, the house was occupied by George Pain of the Northamptonshire ironstone mining family (James Pain Ironstone Co and the Weldon and Corby Brickmaking Co – whose offices were at the junction of Station Road and Northampton Road in Kettering).40

In the early 1920s the house was occupied by Buckley Campbell Praed of a local brewing firm and for whom the Kettering architectural practice of Blackwall and Riddey, later to become Blackwell, Storry and Scott, undertook alterations comprising a number of internal alterations – including some new fireplaces in the main rooms - [Plate 19, 20 & 21]. These plans, in addition to the 1926 OS map [Plate 7], show that originally there was a separate structure, which housed a garage, stables, a wash house and a coal room, to the north of Middlewest (this has since been demolished).

On the northern elevation, there is a small one-storey structure which juts out from the face of the building [Plate 22]. Although it fits in awkwardly with the overall design of the building it is present in the 1922 drawing [Plate 19] and is therefore likely to be original to the building.

By 1933, the house was occupied by a Mary Simpson.41 In the late 1930s, it most likely became a preparatory school run by the Ursaline Sisters.42 By the 1960s, it was in the ownership of the Sisters of Our Lady. It continued to function as a school until 2003 when both Middlewest and Bryn Hafod closed their doors.

### 2.6.3 Middlewest Cottage

No records survive which relate to the original construction date of Middlewest Cottage but it must be assumed that the cottage is of the same date as Middlewest [Plate 23]. Its plan form is clearly shown on the plan of 1922, illustrating a similar footprint as that of today. The only difference is that originally the rear ground floor room (G4) was not internally connected. It previously acted as a store room and was accessed externally from the rear [Plate 24].

---

40 DIA 2007
41 DIA 2007
42 Smith, T., *Fred Moore’s Kettering*, Northamptonshire: 2003, p. 120
2.6.4 Alterations and Additions to Middlewest

Similar to Bryn Hafod, works were carried out by the Sisters of Our Lady in the 1960s. Planning records show that in 1965 a large, standalone extension to the south of Middlewest was constructed. It was designed by Grossmith Products Ltd of Thame, Oxfordshire, and contained classrooms and an assembly hall. This has since been demolished. In 1973, Burles Newton & Partners of Manchester designed a classroom extension to the north of Middlewest. This connected with Middlewest via the original door on the northern elevation. This too has since been demolished.

2.7 Planning History

Planning records accessed on Kettering Council’s website show that in 1992 listed building consent was granted for a garden room extension at the Convent of Our Lady. It is not clear which building this approval refers to as the collective address for all the buildings on the site is ‘Convent of Our Lady’. In any case, these works do not appear to have taken place as neither building has a modern garden room extension. In 1995 listed building consent was granted for repairs to defective areas of roof, chimney stacks and external walls of the main Convent building, which presumably refers to Bryn Hafod (no documents attached online). As Bryn Hafod was not listed until 2004 this consent must have considered it a curtilage building to Middlewest.

In 2007 planning permission and listed building consent was sought for the conversion and alteration of Middlewest and Bryn Hafod to create seven houses (apartments) and the partial demolition of existing buildings. It also included the refurbishment and extension of Middlewest Cottage and Bryn Hafod Cottage. This proposal was refused; the decision notice stated:

> The proposed works include substantial alterations including repeated subdivisions of interior spaces, loss of existing stairs, the construction of new replacement stairs, the insertion of new openings and the closing up of others, the construction of unsympathetic extensions and porches and the demolition of out buildings. The evidence and information submitted with the application fails to justify why these works are necessary, and why other alternative works of less impact are not viable in the interest of preserving the building’s special interest.

In 2008 planning permission and listed building consent was granted for the demolition of extensions to Bryn Hafod and Middlewest and the use of both main buildings as single family dwellings. It also involved the conversion and extension of the small extension to the north of Bryn Hafod to create two additional apartments connected to Bryn Hafod. The link between the chapel and Bryn Hafod was to be removed and the chapel was to be retained for community use. This proposal also involved the retention of the two cottages. Other works included remedial work to external elevations and the reinstatement of terrace gardens forming private curtilages. The planning permission also included a proposal for the erection of 58 dwellings on the site with associated car parking and landscaping. Works that have taken place on site have included the demolition of the 1966 extension to the north of Bryn Hafod and the two modern extensions (1973 & 1965) north and south of Middlewest. However, the rest of the proposal was not implemented.
As this scheme was not executed, planning permission lapsed and so in 2011 an application for the renewal of the permissions was sought but has yet to be determined. Urgent works notices were served by Kettering Council on the 12th January 2012 for all four main buildings on site: Bryn Hafod (ENFO/2010/00180), Bryn Hafod Cottage (ENFO/2011/00178), Middlewest (ENFO/2011/00176) and Middlewest Cottage (ENFO/2011/00177).
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3.0 Building Description & Assessment

3.1 The Setting

The site is located on hill, south-west of the main town of Kettering. It is accessed via Hall Lane, a residential road, which connects with Northampton Road, a local distributor road with mainly large late-19th/early-20th century houses. On entering Hall Lane to the north, the approach is particularly leafy, with shrubs and trees lining both sides of the road. To the west, detached houses are hidden behind the vegetation. The first building encountered is Middlewest Cottage on the eastern side, which proudly stands with its front elevation directly positioned on Hall Lane. Hidden behind this is Middlewest, which can be partially seen over temporary gates. Continuing southwards, more vegetation lines the road until a band of modern two storey brick houses with gabled front elevations is encountered on the western side. Across from these, Bryn Hafod can be glimpsed above low lying bushes. The small garage of Bryn Hafod, with its brick construction and gabled front, is located directly onto the back line of the pavement of Hall Lane but beyond this is a cluster of tall trees and bushes which mask most of Bryn Hafod. Further south, the brick entrance gate to Bryn Hafod is located on Hall Lane and part of the western and southern elevations can be seen above it. The chapel lies to the south of the house but is not visible from street level. Passing more greenery to the east and a large residential park to the west, Bryn Hafod Cottage is next encountered. It is set back from the road and its roof and gabled elevation can be seen above bushes.

The site is bounded by Hall Lane to the west, Northamton Road to the north, the rear gardens of numbers 18-44 Greenfield Avenue to the east, and to the south it forms an angle with Greenhill Road and adjoins the back gardens of numbers 70-82. The site itself is a large open green space with four main buildings. These structures are situated on the western side of the plot and take advantage of the panoramic views of the town centre; the plot slopes down to the east. A pond is located on a lower level, to east of Bryn Hafod. Although the gardens would have originally been planned and designed (certainly in the case of Bryn Hafod) they are now overgrown and any form of formal planning is concealed.

3.2 The Buildings Externally

NB: most windows are currently covered with metal sheeting. Some of the photographs provided are from 2007 so that the architectural detailing can be better understood. The descriptions, therefore, include references to windows which are currently not visible externally.

3.2.1 Bryn Hafod

The house is built in Leicestershire pressed brick (according to The Builder description) in Flemish bond and with Ketton stone dressings, with red tiled roofs [Plate 3a-b]. It is a handsome design in a seventeenth-century manner, approached modestly through a small brick archway (now missing its ball finials) rather than by a sweeping drive [Plate 25]. Indeed the original plan [Plate 8] does not show accommodation for carriages or horses, merely a bicycle house.
Decorative detail is concentrated on the garden (east) front and entrance (south). The roadway frontage, with the exception of the southern wing and stair window of leaded casements, has a utilitarian design with plain sash windows befitting a service wing. It was clearly always meant to be largely concealed from view by planting or fencing with the result that some more recent and less sensitive alterations, such as new windows to the former Scullery (G13) and the first floor extension (F21-F30), are largely overlooked.

The main elevation is the garden front on the eastern side [Plate 3a-b]. Four gables dominate the front with (flanking the rear entrance door) two single storey, stone-mullioned bay windows – whose Jacobean strapwork parapet detailing recalls that on other Gotch buildings in Kettering, such as the overdoors to shops in Market Street and the parapet to the former Liberal Club on the Horse Market. The central arched spandrel window (‘Gotch’ style window) in each bay window can also be found on the garden front windows at Gotch’s Elm Bank. The ground floor window to the most northerly bay is a later insertion (not shown on The Builder plan of 1901 – Plate 8). The six first floor windows have all stone mullions and transoms with leaded upper lights.

The main entrance to the house is on the south front with a door recessed under a moulded stone arch [Plate 25] and with a projecting chimney stack, incorporating Wicksteed’s initials and date “C 1898 W” [Plate 5]. Upper windows, as those on the garden front, are stone mullioned and transomed with an attractive bow window to the right of the door on the ground floor. A modern cast iron plaque commemorating the life of Wicksteed is fixed over the entrance door arch.

This entrance is in marked contrast to the grand garden entrance (an arched door head with a fanlight above divided by a stone mullion, with flanking mullioned and transomed windows) whose door opens directly onto the garden terrace and is positioned on the central axis of the Hall [Plate 12]. The latter is thus in a much more pivotal location than the formal main (south) entrance whose relationship to the rest of the ground floor plan is deliberately understated, enabling visitors to be ushered into the centre of the house almost in ‘secret’ or conversely permitting visitors to come to the house and to be sent away – all without impinging on the functioning of the house proper.

The south elevation is much compromised by the modern link to the Chapel which created a new opening in this front – and necessitated a corridor being formed through the Drawing Room (G6) beyond [Plate 27]. The north elevation is even further compromised as it is completely concealed behind the modern first floor extension of the northern structure [Plate 10].

One of the major characteristics of the house is the splendid variety of leaded lights to the upper openings in the stone mullion and transom windows and to some ground floor casements. These were produced by George Wragge in a wide variety of geometric patterns – those with curving swirls to the main stair window being particularly attractive. It is regretful that a number of the windows of the house have lost these leaded lights (principally to opening casements where they are more susceptible to damage), breaking the cohesion and rhythm of the window pattern.

The roofline is dominated by gables and chimneys with unusual entablature caps which incorporate up-draft ventilators.
3.2.2 The Chapel

The chapel is a distinctive 1960s structure. It lies to the south of Bryn Hafod and is connected to the main house via a link. The link is located between two ground floor windows of Bryn Hafod (G5 & G6). Its presence is unfortunate as it compromises Bryn Hafod’s south elevation. The link building consists of a solid western wall, with double doors, and a glazed and timber panelled eastern wall, with a central door [Plate 27]. This is currently in poor condition with the glazing mostly missing.

The chapel itself is fairly modest [Plate 28]. It is of grey brick construction and has plain elevations to the north and south. The western and eastern elevations are similar and consist of three bays which have tall stained glass windows with arched heads. Dividing these bays are thin vertical sections of brickwork which protrude out from the main façade. A vertical line of glazed blocks embellishes these projecting units [Plate 29].

3.2.3 Bryn Hafod Cottage

Although Bryn Hafod Cottage is quite modest in design, it is an attractive building that is located within a charming setting. It is designed in a similar fashion to Bryn Hafod, with the use of Leicestershire pressed brick in Flemish bond, Ketton stone dressings and red tiled roofs. Also like Bryn Hafod, the main entrance does not face Hall Lane; the entrance is located to the south. This southern elevation is quite quaint with a central door, a two-over-two sash window to the west and a charming canted bay window with a tiled roof to the east [Plate 30a-b]. The west elevation (facing Hall Lane) is quite plain, with a first floor sash window below adding some interest. The north elevation is more varied and the L-shaped plan of the building becomes apparent with the presence of a protruding gabled section. There is a mix of window sizes and types and a door is located in the centre serving the rear of the building [Plate 31a-b]. Like the western elevation, the eastern elevation is also quite plain with a gabled end and one sash window at first floor level. A stone banding runs around the whole structure, adding some detail and interest.

3.2.4 Middlewest

Middlewest is red brick and roughcast render building with an L-shaped plan, mullioned and transomed windows and a hipped roof with dormers [Plate 12]. It sits comfortably back from the road with an entrance court. The house is a robust and handsome design of Carolean style, two storeys high with attics. It is built of the same large sized bricks which characterise Elm Bank – a local product but here laid in English bond – with local Weldon Stone dressings for string courses, main window mullions and transoms and main entrance door surrounds. The first floor walls are finished in roughcast render, left in its original natural state (now a rare survival), framed by wide, red brick corner pilasters. The whole is capped by a generous modillion eaves cornice with hipped clay tile roof and round headed, lead-clad dormers.

Unlike Bryn Hafod the entrance front faces Hall Lane, with an entrance door flanked by pairs of casements in stone surrounds and with a five-light, stone mullion-and-transom window over, lighting the double height Stair Hall beyond. However the relationships of front entrance to garden entrance to ground floor plan offer interesting contrasts with the plan of Bryn Hafod – with the same orientation and dominance of the garden entrance and main hall space.
As at Bryn Hafod, the garden front is an impressive composition with a pair of single storey bays to the principal ground floor reception rooms [Plates 16 & 32]. Similarly the extensive use of leaded lights of varying design again mirrors one of the key design features. The garden entrance is also similar to Bryn Hafod with an arched door head and a fanlight above divided by a stone mullion, and flanking mullion-and-transom windows [Plates 13 & 14].

The northern elevation is quite utilitarian, with sash windows serving service rooms at ground floor level, a service entrance door and a peculiar section that juts out to the east which was previously used as a store and utility room [Plate 22]. Leaded casements can be found on the first floor, serving the original guests’ dressing room.

The roofscape is now flat and unrelieved but site evidence suggests that at least two chimney stacks have been removed leaving only one intact – that on the projecting northern wing.

3.2.5 Middlewest Cottage

The cottage is appealingly set directly onto the back line of the pavement giving a presence on the street quite unlike that of the largely hidden main house behind [Plate 23a-b]. However in its use of materials it echoes those of the main house with use of roughcast render and local red brick– though here using a standard brick in stretcher bond. Otherwise detailing is much more basic and simplified than the main house, with all effect concentrated on the front with its bracketed dormer windows and projecting porch with its six panel front door and leaded lights. To the rear and side elevations plain sashes take over and these elevations are strictly utilitarian.

3.3 The Buildings Internally

3.3.1 Bryn Hafod

Ground Floor

G1
This is the original cloakroom of the house. An original wall divides the room to create a separate WC space. The room has an original terrazzo floor and leaded casement windows with architraves. The walls are plainly decorated with a simple skirting and coat hooks. An original five paneled door leads into the room, whilst an original four paneled door serves the WC. Modern central hanging light.

G2
This is an entrance hall with an original terrazzo floor. All joinery is original, including the entrance door, skirting, architraves, and picture rail. Original timber decorative arch marks the entrance to G3. Original cornice and a modern centrally hanging light.

G3
Room that connects with G2 and leads to the main hall (G4) at a 90 degree angle. Original terrazzo floor and original joinery, including skirting and architraves. Original four paneled door serves a cupboard beneath the main staircase. Original leaded casement window with stone mullions. Original cornice.
G4
Large hall with main rooms disposed around and main staircase. This room contains a wealth of original features. Original compartmentalised decorative plasterwork ceiling with classical decorative frieze with putti, arabesques and medallions, and stylised lion head brackets supporting the downstand beams. The ceiling is damaged in areas. All joinery, such as wainscoting, decorative architraves, doors and joinery surrounding the chimneypiece, is original; supported by drawings of the interior in the Builder in 1901 [Plates 33-36]. The chimneypiece appears to have been replaced in the 1930s with a tiled fire insert. Original entrance door with flanking leaded casements with stone mullions and transoms. Original cupboards either side. Modern lights hang from the four corners of the room, from circular sections with ceiling roses within the decorative plasterwork scheme. Original timber floor.

An original double arched timber screen with an unusual stylised column marks two routes out of the room; the first is the main staircase and the other is the area to the left of the main staircase leading to G3 [Plate 37].

Original tight, open well staircase with closed strings. The bottom steps of the staircase are wider and have curved edges. Wooden handrail with painted square balusters with reeded detailing. Original skirting to staircase. Large original leaded casement window with stone mullions at half landing. The area to the left of the staircase has original wainscoting. Original architrave but door appears to be missing.

G5
Originally functioned as the Morning Room, this room contains many original features. Original chimney piece in the Adam style. Original cornice, picture rail, skirting, nine panelled door and timber floor. Original leaded casement window with stone mullions and transoms.

G6
Original drawing room; this room has decreased in size as a result of the modern partition that was installed in the 1960s to create a corridor connecting the chapel with the main hall (G6A). The room has many original features, including all joinery and an egg-and-dart cornice with an anthemion frieze. An original curved bay window to the south with on original casement window with stone mullions and timber panelling below. Large original canted bay window to the east with ‘Gotch’ style window with timber panelling below [Plate 38]. This is framed by an original decorative arched timber screen. The chimney piece has been stolen. The ceiling is covered in embossed paper (possibly original), with later 20th century light fittings. Original timber floor.

G6A
This corridor was formed when the chapel was constructed in 1963. Three original walls and one modern partition. Original cornices and frieze to the original walls. Original skirting to the original walls which appears to have been copied on the partition wall. Plain modern door leads to the external link, whilst an original nine panelled door serves the hall. Original floorboards. The ceiling has been covered in embossed paper (possibly original). Original timber floor.

G7
The original use of this room was as a living room. Like the rest of the main rooms it has retained many original features. There is an intriguing serving hatch with rotating shelves
which is accessed from the kitchen corridor (G12) [Plate 39]. A hatch is shown in this location on The Builder plan [Plate 8], demonstrating that it is original. The increased bulk arising from its revolving shelf form may date from the Sisters’ time to permit the serving of food in silence.

The room contains original joinery in the form of skirtings, dado rail, picture rail, nine panelled door and matching arched timber screens surrounding the door and an alcove [Plate 40]. There is also an original arched timber screen framing the original canted bay window [Plate 40]. This window matched that found in G6. There is a large original timber chimney surround with pilasters, a central panel with foliage and a mirrored overmantel with flanking paired columns (missing on the right hand side) [Plate 41]. The tiled fire insert appears to be a later addition, possibly 1930s. The ceiling is covered in embossed paper and has an original cornice and decorative frieze. Centrally hanging wire for light fitting. Original timber floor.

G8
This was a study and contains built-in shelving to the right of the chimneypiece which appears to be original (indicated on The Builder plan - Plate 8). Original joinery, including a six panelled door, architraves, skirting and picture rail. Original classical style timber chimneypiece with a cast iron grate and flanking red tiles. Original one over one sash window with contemporary architrave. Original floorboards and a centrally hanging light.

G9
This room original functioned as a store and it appears to have retained all the original shelving units along the north wall (indicated on The Builder plan - Plate 8). Plain room with original skirting and timber floor. Original four panelled door with architrave, although the two upper panels have been replaced with glazing. Original one over one sash with contemporary architrave. Modern strip lighting.

G10
This room now connects with the kitchen (G11) although originally a wall separated the two, and this room operated as a china closet. The dividing wall has been removed, although nibs and downstand remain. The original door has been blocked up and the architraves removed. Modern fit out with tiling to walls and floor, modern kitchen units and strip lighting. Original one over one sash with contemporary architrave.

G11
This room now connects with G10. Modern fit out with tiling to walls and floor, modern kitchen units and strip lighting. Two original one over one sashes with contemporary architraves. Two original four panelled door and architraves. Large original hearth with modern tiles.

G12
Corridor space serving the service room. Original hatch which serves G7. Modern tiled floor and plain ceiling (damaged in areas). Original secondary staircase with closed strings. Plain timber handrail with white painted square balusters and newel posts with round finials. White painted timber panelling beneath. The bottom steps wind at a 90 degree angle. Original secondary entrance door beneath staircase most likely removed when the external link was formed in the 1960s (not inspected as currently covered in boarding). Mostly original doors and architraves, including the four panelled door leading into G13. Modern door connecting G4 with G12. Modern tiled floor.
G13
Originally a scullery, the room has a modern kitchen fit out with tiling to walls and floor, modern kitchen units and strip lighting. One original one over one sash and two modern casements. What appears to be an original door leading to the outside. Modern flush door to cupboard.

G14
Original larder which still retains its original counter top and shelving. Original window, four panelled door and architraves. Modern tiled floor and walls. Modern strip lighting.

G15
Original wash kitchen, the room has a modern kitchen fit out with tiling to walls and floor, modern kitchen units and strip lighting. One original two over two sash. Large modern casement window on east wall, which has been designed in concrete (?) to look like a traditional Gotch type casement with Mullions, transoms and leaded glazing units [Plate 42]. Although the attempt to stay in keeping with Gotch’s style, it has been poorly executed with unsightly construction joints. An original four panelled door leads to the outside, whilst an original four panelled door serves the room from G12.

First Floor

F1
This room was originally larger as it also accommodated F1A and F1B. Partitions were installed possibly in the 1930s or 1950s to create a separate bathroom (F1A). The room has an original skirting which also appears on the partition wall (presumably reused from bathroom area as this is tiled). Original picture rail, cornice and timber floor. An original chimneybreast but the chimneypiece has been removed and blocked up. Original five panelled door which was rehung when the partitions were added. Centrally hanging modern light fitting. Original leaded casement window with stone Mullions and transoms.

F1A
Bathroom created in the 1930s/50s with the addition of partitions and a door. Modern bathroom fit out will tiled walls and original timber floor. Original leaded casement window with mullions and transoms. Original cornice survives on the two original walls.

F1B
Corridor formed when bathroom (F1A) was created in the 1930s/50s with the addition of partitions. Original timber floor. Original skirting on partition wall which was presumably reused from bathroom area. Original five panelled door leading into F1 was rehung from its original position within F1B. Original architraves survive.

F2
Plain room with original five panelled door, architraves, skirting, cornice and timber floor. Original leaded casement window with stone Mullions and transoms.

F3
F4
Original five panelled doors, architraves, skirting, picture rail, cornice and timber floor. Two original leaded casement windows with stone mullions and transoms. Chimneypiece is missing (presumed stolen) although the grate and some tiles survive.

F5
Original cupboard space serving F4. Original five panelled door, skirting and dado.

F6
Original tight, open well staircase with closed strings. Wooden handrail with painted square balusters with reeded detailing. Square newel posts with reeded decoration and rounded square finials. Original skirting to staircase. Large original leaded casement window with stone mullions at half landing [Plate 43]. Two original large arched screens framing the entrance to the main corridor and the secondary corridor. Two unsightly 1989 glazed fire screens now enclose the space. Original cornice.

F7
Large main corridor space serving the bedrooms. Original skirting, picture rail, cornice, doors and architraves. An original timber arched screen marks the change from a large open space to a narrower corridor (F18). Modern fire screen.

F8
Original five panelled door and architrave. Original leaded casement window with stone mullions and transoms. Appears to be a modern skirting and original cornice (missing in places). Original built-in cupboard. Original floor boards and a light hanging close to the window.

F9
Original skirting, picture rail, timber floor, five panelled door and architraves. Original cornice with coved frieze (missing in places). Original leaded casement window with stone mullions and transoms. Missing chimneypiece (presumed stolen) although the grate remains.

F10
Original skirting, timber floor, cornice, five panelled door and architraves. Original sash window with contemporary architrave. Original chimneybreast with unusual stepped out detailing. Missing chimneypiece (presumed stolen). Three panelled door connects F10 with F11 which is a later addition, possibly 1950s.

F11-13
F11 and F13 were bathrooms and F12 functioned as a separate WC. The entrances to F11 and F13 are at a 45 degree angle with F12 in the centre [Plate 44]. The entrance to F12 is framed by an original timber arched screen. Original one over one sashes and floor boards to all rooms, original skirting on some walls and several walls have modern tiles. Original architraves and original four and three panelled doors, although the three panelled door appear to be altered four panelled doors. 1950s door connects F11 to F10.

F14
Original skirting, timber floor, cornice, four panelled door and architraves. Original sash window with contemporary architrave. Original chimneybreast with missing chimneypiece.
(presumed stolen). Low level arched alcove to the right of the chimneybreast. Built-in cupboard to the left of the chimneybreast, presumably original.

F15
Plain room with original timber floor, four panelled door and architraves. Simple skirtings, presumably original. Two original one over one sash windows with contemporary architraves. Missing chimneypiece (presumed stolen). Modern strip lighting. The northern wall marks the original external wall of the house.

F16
Corridor leading to modern extension. Simple skirtings, presumably original. Original sash window with contemporary architrave. Original doors and architraves to original rooms, a modern plain flush doors leads to F30. Four steps lead from F17 to F16.

F17
Original dog leg secondary staircase with half landing and closed strings. Plain timber handrail with white painted square balusters and newel posts with round finials [Plate 45]. Original skirtings. 1989 glazed fire screen and nine paneled casement window with architrave that appears to be original. Original plain casement window with stone mullion at half landing. Original floor boards.

F18
Corridor connecting F7 with F16 and serving bedrooms and bathrooms. As previously described, the entrances to F11 and F13 are at a 45 degree angle with F12 in the centre. Original octagon shaped flat roof light above [Plate 46]. The entrances to F12 and F7 are framed by original timber arched screens. Original skirting, cornice and decorative frieze (missing in places). Original doors and architraves to rooms. Original floor boards.

F19
Original skirting, timber floor, picture rail, cornice, four panelled doors and architraves. Original leaded casement window with stone mullions and transoms. Original chimneybreast with missing chimneypiece (presumed stolen) although the grate and tiles remain. Modern strip lighting.

F20
Original skirting, timber floor, picture rail, doors and architraves. Original cornice and plain coved frieze (both missing in places). Two original leaded casement windows with stone mullions and transoms. Similar to G67, on the south wall matching arched timber screens surrounding the door and an alcove with inbuilt shelving. Original chimneybreast with missing chimneypiece (presumed stolen) although the grate and tiles remain. Modern hanging light near to window.

F21-30
Modern extension presumably added in 1966 when the northern convent extension was added (now demolished). Modern fit out.
Second Floor

S1
Plain attic room with sloping ceiling. Original skirting to some walls. Original built in unit with door serving eastern eaves space. Original window bay and timber floor.

S2
Plain attic room with sloping ceiling. Original skirting to some walls. Original door serving western eaves space. Original window bay and timber floor. Original four panelled doors and architraves.

S3
Plain attic room with sloped ceiling details within western corners. Original skirting, timber floor and door serving western eaves space. Three original one over one sash windows and small painted window serving S4. Original four panelled door and architraves. Missing chimney piece (presumed stolen).

S4
Small attic room with sloped ceiling. Original skirting and timber floor. Two original one over one sash window. Original four panelled door and architraves with an original square hollowed section above with architraves. Original small window (painted) with architraves and a small casement window on the northern wall which appears to be a later addition.

S5
Original dog leg secondary staircase with half landing and closed strings. Plain timber handrail with white painted square balusters and newel posts with round finials. Original skirtings. Original plain casement window with stone mullion at half landing. Original floor boards. Small original built in cupboard on southern wall. Three original steps with curved edges lead to S2. Original doors and architraves to rooms.

3.3.2 The Chapel

G1
This link was formed in 1963 to connect the new chapel with Bryn Hafod [Plate 27]. Timber boarding and large areas of glazing (missing) to the east, with solid wall construction to the west. In poor condition. Modern tiled floor.

G2
Sacristory - Not accessed

G3
Small room leading from G4. Original modern fittings with skirting, tiled floors and glazed blocks in a vertical line allowing light in.

G4
Main chapel hall [Plate 47]. Has undergone some alteration in the 1900s but the plan form has remained intact [See Plate 9 & Appendix III]. Original glazed blocks in vertical lines allowing light in with yellow stained glass panels in front. Six stain glassed windows installed

3.3.3 Bryn Hafod Cottage

Ground Floor

G1
Plain room with no remaining features except for original architraves and a two over two sash window.

G2
Original four panelled doors and architraves (have been stripped) and original skirting. Original two over two sash window. Original chimneypiece. Plain ceiling with damaged areas.

G3
Original straight flight staircase. Original four panelled doors and architraves (have been stripped) to G2 and G3.

G4
Original four panelled door and architraves (have been stripped) and original skirting. Original chimneybreast but the chimneypiece has been removed and blocked up. Plain ceiling with damaged areas. Original canted bay window. Original timber floor boards.

G5
This room last functioned as a WC and is in poor condition with the plaster ceiling mostly missing. Original four panelled door. Window boarded up so not inspection but original architrave remains. Appears to be an original skirting.

G6
Built-in cupboard underneath the staircase with a modern flush door.

First Floor

F1
Plain room with sloped ceiling last fitted out as a bathroom, although fittings are missing. Modern tiles to most walls. Original four panelled door and architraves (have been stripped), although the door currently lies unattached against the southern wall. Original two over two sash window.

F2
Plain room with sloped ceiling. Original four panelled door, double two panelled doors serving a built in cupboard and architraves (have been stripped). Original two over two sash window. No skirting. Original timber floor.

F3
Plain room with sloped ceiling. Original four panelled door, double two panelled doors serving a built in cupboard and architraves (have been stripped). Original two over two sash window. No skirting. Original timber floor.
3.3.4 Middlewest

Ground Floor

G1
Previously functioning as a study, this room has an original three panelled door, architraves, skirting, cornice, timber floor and a lugged timber chimneypiece with cast iron grate. Original leaded casement window with stone mullions and timber panelling below. Smaller original leaded casement on the western wall with stone surround. Modern strip lighting.

G2
This drawing room has an original three panelled door, architraves, skirting, cornice with dentil detailing, picture rail and timber floor. Original canted bay with leaded casement windows with timber mullions and transoms and timber panelling below [Plate 49]. The plan of 1922 shows that originally this bay had window seats [Plate 19]. Original leaded casement on the southern wall with stone mullions and transoms. Original Adam style chimneypiece with unattractive modern cupboards either side chimneybreast. Modern strip lighting.

G3
Large hall that connects with the main staircase. The large stone chimneypiece with bolection moulding and arched centre appears to have been installed in the 1920s, see 1922 drawings [Plate 19]. Original entrance door with flanking casement with stone mullions and transoms. Original timber floor, doors, architraves, skirting, picture rail and cornice with dentil detailing. Modern strip lighting.

G4
Entrance hall (accessed from front door on western side) which contains the main staircase [Plate 51]. Original black and white chequered tiled floor leads, on northern side, to curving stone steps down to a cloakroom area (G6). Original open-well polished oak stairs with Tuscan column-on-vase balusters with massive Tuscan column newels framing G3 and square newels with linenfold decoration on the main staircase. Original built-in cupboard and shelving with arched head, part of the staircase set-piece, in the south-eastern corner. Original skirting, cornice, doors and architraves. Small original casement window with stone surround to the south of the entrance door, and original casement with stone mullion to the north.

G5
Cupboard under the main staircase - not inspected.

G6-7
Original lavatory space with separate partitioned WC (G7). Original black and white chequered tiled floor and original doors and architraves. Original casement with stone mullions.

G8
Original drawing room, this room has been extended to incorporate G8A with the removal of a wall and creation of a large arched opening [Plate 52]. Original canted bay with leaded casement windows with timber mullions and transoms and timber panelling below. The plan of 1922 shows that originally this bay had window seats [Plate 19]. An original arched timber
screen frames the bay window [Plate 52]. Original leaded casement on the eastern wall with stone mullions and transoms. 17th century timber chimneypiece that was installed in the 1920s, see drawing of chimneypiece [Plate 21 & 53]. Original three panelled door, architraves, skirting, cornice and timber floor. Modern strip lighting.

G8A
Originally a store and utility room, this room has been incorporated into G8 with the removal of a wall and creation of a large arched opening [Plate 52]. This led to the blocking up of the original doorway to the west and the removal of an internal wall. Unappealing area with concrete floor and a kitchen area with modern worktop units, some tiling, skirting and built-in cupboards. Original sash window with architraves.

G9
Corridor that serves the service rooms. Original terrazzo floor tiles [Plate 54] with original skirting and cornice. The original secondary entrance door has been replaced with a modern glazed door. Original architraves and doors to rooms, with a modern door to secondary staircase area (G11).

G10
Originally a kitchen, was later used as a classroom. Original five panelled door and architraves. Windows not inspected but presumably two original sash windows.

G11
Original dog leg secondary staircase with plain wooden handrail, white painted stick balusters, square newel posts and skirting. Original five panelled doors with architraves to outside and G12 and a modern flush door to space under the stairs. Original leaded casement window with stone mullion.

G12
Originally two rooms containing a larder and a scullery, the dividing wall has been removed and the area is fitted out with modern partitions forming WCs. Original five panelled door and architraves. Windows not inspected but presumably two original sashes.

First Floor

F1
The 1922 plan shows this room previously functioned as a large bathroom. Now a large awkward modern staircase fills the space [Plate 55]. Original skirting, timber floor and two original two panelled doors with architraves. Large original leaded casement window, obscured by staircase.

F2
Original joinery, including skirting, timber floor, picture rail and architraves. Two original two panelled doors and a matching two panelled door leading into F3 which was installed in 1922 [Plate 19]. Original cornice. Original chimneybreast but missing chimneypiece (presumed stolen). Three original leaded casement windows.
F3
Original joinery, including skirting, timber floor, picture rail and architraves. Original two
panelled door and a matching two panelled door leading into F2 which was installed in 1922
[Plate 19]. Doorway leading into F4 is a modern addition; modern door lays unattached
against chimney wall. Original cornice, timber chimneypiece and leaded casement window.

F4
This room has been enlarged (with the removal of walls) to incorporate an original guest
bathroom and a linen cupboard [Plate 19 & 56]. Original cornice stops where the main wall
was removed, the original skirting and picture rail have been made-good so that they run
around the whole room [Plate 56]. Original fanlight above original five panelled door (and
architrave) leading to F9A. Original two panelled door with architraves serving F8 and a
modern door leading to F3 (currently unattached). Original timber chimneypiece similar to that
of F3 [Plate 57]. Three original leaded casement windows with architraves. Original timber
floor boards. Modern strip lighting.

F5/F5A
Original open-well polished oak staircase with Tuscan column-on-vase balusters and square
newels, some with linenfold decoration. Attractive curve where the staircase meets the first
floor. Original skirting and picture rail. Original enriched cornice with egg-and-dart motif.
Original built-in shelving in south-eastern corner of F5. Original doors and architraves to
rooms, whilst a modern glazed partition divides the corridor, separating F5A from F8. Large
original leaded casement window with stone mullions and transoms. Original timber floor
throughout.

F6
WC with some original skirting, five panelled door and architraves and a casement window.

F7
Original closet, this room appears to retain an original built-in cupboard with sliding door.
Some original skirting, five panelled door and architraves and a casement window with stone
mullions and transoms. Original timber floor.

F8
Corridor which originally extended to the northern external wall but was decreased in size with
the removal of the wall of F9 and the relocation of F9’s door. Modern glazed door separates
the space from F5A. Contains an original cupboard occupying part of F7 with an original five
panelled door and architraves. Original cornice, skirting and floor boards. Original doors and
architraves to rooms.

F9/F9A
Previous guest bedroom, this room was extended with the removal of a wall to incorporate the
corridor (F9A) and the door was repositioned [Plate 58]. The original five panelled door lies
unattached against the wall, whilst a later door frame with glazed panels above remains in
place. An original five panelled door serves F4. The 1922 plans showings that the picture rail
was added at this time [Plate 20]. Original skirting, timber floor and timber chimneypiece with
grate and tiled cheeks. Arched alcove to the right of the chimneypiece with what appears to
be original shelving. Three original casements, with the central double in size.
F10
Corridor which leads to the secondary staircase (F11). Original timber floor, skirting, dado and cornice. Original five panelled door from F8 and modern flush fire door leads to F11.

F11
Original dog leg secondary staircase with plain wooden handrail, white painted stick balusters, square newel posts and skirting [Plate 59]. Original five panelled doors with architraves to F12 and modern flush door to F10. Original leaded casement window with stone mullion. Original dado.

F12
Originally functioned as a servants’ sitting room, this room retains original timber floor, skirting and picture rail. Corner chimney piece is missing (presumed stolen). Original five panelled door and architraves. Original casement window with timber mullions and transoms. Modern strip lighting.

Second Floor

S1
Awkward modern timber staircase rising from first floor room (F1). Modern glazed partition at top of staircase. Original dormer window.

S2
Corridor with original timber floor, dormer windows and four panelled doors accessing cupboards within the eaves. Simple skirting, appears to be original.

S3/S3A
Modern partitions and doors create two separate rooms (S3 & S3A). Original chimney piece with a central corbel like feature within S3 [Plate 60]. Original four panelled door to cupboard space within eaves in S3A. Simple skirting which appears to be original and has been copied on modern partitions. Original dormer windows.

S4
Original chimney piece and original four panelled door to cupboard space within eaves. Simple skirting which appears to be original and original picture rail, floor boards and dormer window. Original four panelled door and architraves. Modern strip lighting.

S5-S5B
Modern partitions with high level glazing have been added to create a corridor (F5A) separating F5 from F5B. Original five panelled door serves F5A. Simple skirting throughout which appears to be original. Original floor boards and dormer windows. Original four panelled doors serve cupboard spaces within eaves. Modern strip lighting.

S6
Original chimney piece, floor boards and dormer window. Simple skirting which appears to be original. Original four panelled door and architraves. Modern strip lighting.
S7
Fitted out with modern bathroom fittings and tiles. Some original skirting. Vertical boarding to peculiar square extension within the room. Original four panelled door with architraves.

S8
Original dog leg secondary staircase with plain wooden handrail, white painted stick balusters, square newel posts and skirting. Modern flush separates the stairwell from the main corridor (S2). Original skirting and dodo rail.

3.3.5 Middlewest Cottage

Ground Floor

G1
Plain room with original architraves although doors appear to be missing (rear door not inspected). Original chimneybreast but chimneypiece has been removed and blocked up. Windows not inspected but possible original sash beneath modern boarding. Concrete floor.

G2
Original straight flight staircase. Original four panelled doors and architraves (have been stripped) to G1 and G3 at 45 degree angles. Entrance door with original flanking casements at a 45 degree angle.

G3
Plain room with original architraves but doors appear to be missing. Modern doorway created between G3 and G4; originally G4 was used as a store and did not connect with other rooms internally [Plate 19]. Original chimneybreast but chimneypiece is missing (presumed stolen). Windows not inspected but possible original sashes beneath modern boarding. Concrete floor.

G4
Previous store room, no features of interest. The window and back door were boarded up so could not be inspected but possible original sash, whilst the door may be later as may have been updated when the room no longer functioned as a store. Concrete floor.

G5
Small room under staircase. Original architraves but doors appear to be missing. Tiled floor and possible original sashes beneath modern boarding but was unable to inspect.

First Floor

F1
Plain room with original chimneypiece, timber floor and casement dormer window [Plate 61]. Original architraves but door appears to be missing.

F2
Plain room with original chimneypiece, timber floor and casement dormer window. Original architraves but door appears to be missing.
F3
Small area at the top of stairs with no window. Original timber floors and architraves to F1 and F2.

F4
Plain room with original timber floor and casement dormer window. Original architraves but door appears to be missing.
4.0 Proposals & Justification

4.1 Description of the Proposals and their Impact on the Listed Building
To be done

4.2 Justification of the Proposals
To be done

4.3 Conclusion
To be done
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Planning Policy and Guidance
Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

The Act is legislative basis for decision making on applications that relate to the historic environment.

Sections 66 of the Act impose a statutory duty upon local planning authorities to consider the impact of proposals upon listed buildings.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that ‘in considering whether to grant permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or as the case may be the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses’.

National Planning Policy Framework

Any proposals for consent relating to heritage assets are subject to the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012). This sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. With regard to ‘Conserving and enhancing the historic environment’, the framework requires proposals relating to heritage assets to be justified and an explanation of their effect on the heritage asset’s significance provided.

With regard to the significance of a heritage asset, the framework contains the following policies:

‘Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal.’

In determining applications local planning authorities are required to take account of significance, viability, sustainability and local character and distinctiveness. The NPPF identifies the following criteria in relation to this;

• the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
• the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
• the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

With regard to potential ‘harm’ to the significance designated heritage asset, the framework states the following;

‘great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.’
With regard to ‘less than substantial harm’ to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the NPPF states the following:

‘Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.’

Planning Practice Guidance

The planning practice guidance was published on the 6th March 2014 to support the National Planning Policy Framework and the planning system. It includes particular guidance on matters relating to protecting the historic environment in the section: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment. The following guidance is relevant:

**Paragraph 3: What is meant by the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment?**

The conservation of heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance is a core planning principle. Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and effective conservation delivers wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits.

Conservation is an active process of maintenance and managing change. It requires a flexible and thoughtful approach to get the best out of assets as diverse as listed buildings in every day use to as yet undiscovered, undesignated buried remains of archaeological interest.

In the case of buildings, generally the risks of neglect and decay of heritage assets are best addressed through ensuring that they remain in active use that is consistent with their conservation. Ensuring such heritage assets remain used and valued is likely to require sympathetic changes to be made from time to time. In the case of archaeological sites, many have no active use, and so for those kinds of sites, periodic changes may not be necessary.

Where changes are proposed, the National Planning Policy Framework sets out a clear framework for both plan-making and decision-taking to ensure that heritage assets are conserved, and where appropriate enhanced, in a manner that is consistent with their significance and thereby achieving sustainable development.

Part of the public value of heritage assets is the contribution that they can make to understanding and interpreting our past. So where the complete or partial loss of a heritage asset is justified, the aim then is to capture and record the evidence of the asset’s significance which is to be lost, interpret its contribution to the understanding of our past, and make that publicly available.
Paragraph 9: Why is ‘significance’ important in decision-taking?

Heritage assets may be affected by direct physical change or by change in their setting. Being able to properly assess the nature, extent and importance of the significance of a heritage asset, and the contribution of its setting, is very important to understanding the potential impact and acceptability of development proposals.

Paragraph 13: What is the setting of a heritage asset and how should it be taken into account?

The “setting of a heritage asset” is defined in the Glossary of the National Planning Policy Framework.

A thorough assessment of the impact on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it.

Setting is the surroundings in which an asset is experienced, and may therefore be more extensive than its curtilage. All heritage assets have a setting, irrespective of the form in which they survive and whether they are designated or not.

The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places. For example, buildings that are in close proximity but are not visible from each other may have a historic or aesthetic connection that amplifies the experience of the significance of each.

The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting. This will vary over time and according to circumstance.

When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change. They may also need to consider the fact that developments which materially detract from the asset’s significance may also damage its economic viability now, or in the future, thereby threatening its ongoing conservation.

Paragraph 15: What is a viable use for a heritage asset and how is it taken into account in planning decisions?
The vast majority of heritage assets are in private hands. Thus, sustaining heritage assets in the long term often requires an incentive for their active conservation. Putting heritage assets to a viable use is likely to lead to the investment in their maintenance necessary for their long-term conservation.

By their nature, some heritage assets have limited or even no economic end use. A scheduled monument in a rural area may preclude any use of the land other than as a pasture, whereas a listed building may potentially have a variety of alternative uses such as residential, commercial and leisure.

In a small number of cases a heritage asset may be capable of active use in theory but be so important and sensitive to change that alterations to accommodate a viable use would lead to an unacceptable loss of significance.

It is important that any use is viable, not just for the owner, but also the future conservation of the asset. It is obviously desirable to avoid successive harmful changes carried out in the interests of repeated speculative and failed uses.

If there is only one viable use, that use is the optimum viable use. If there is a range of alternative viable uses, the optimum use is the one likely to cause the least harm to the significance of the asset, not just through necessary initial changes, but also as a result of subsequent wear and tear and likely future changes.

The optimum viable use may not necessarily be the most profitable one. It might be the original use, but that may no longer be economically viable or even the most compatible with the long-term conservation of the asset. However, if from a conservation point of view there is no real difference between viable uses, then the choice of use is a decision for the owner.

Harmful development may sometimes be justified in the interests of realising the optimum viable use of an asset, notwithstanding the loss of significance caused provided the harm is minimised. The policy in addressing substantial and less than substantial harm is set out in paragraphs 132 – 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Paragraph 19: How can proposals avoid or minimise harm to the significance of a heritage asset?**

A clear understanding of the significance of a heritage asset and its setting is necessary to develop proposals which avoid or minimise harm. Early appraisals, a conservation plan or targeted specialist investigation can help to identify constraints and opportunities arising from the asset at an early stage. Such studies can reveal alternative development options, for
example more sensitive designs or different orientations, that will deliver public benefits in a more sustainable and appropriate way.

**Paragraph 20: What is meant by the term public benefits?**

Public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental progress as described in the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 7). Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and should not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefits.

Public benefits may include heritage benefits, such as:

- sustaining or enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting
- reducing or removing risks to a heritage asset
- securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset in support of its long term conservation

**Kettering Borough Council**

**The North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy**

The North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy sets out the overall strategic plan for North Northamptonshire. This CSS was adopted in June 2008. It has been prepared by a Joint Planning Committee which is made up of elected representatives from Northamptonshire County Council, Corby Borough Council, Kettering Borough Council, East Northamptonshire District Council and the Borough Council of Wellingborough. The Core Spatial Strategy sets out the long-term spatial vision for the four local planning authorities in the area (including Kettering Borough Council) and the strategic policies and proposals to deliver that vision. It co-ordinates growth, considers the roles and relationships between settlements, and presents the strategy for infrastructure provision.

In relation to heritage, the following policy is relevant:

**Policy 13: General Sustainable Development Principles**

Development should meet the needs of residents and businesses without compromising the ability of future generations to enjoy the same quality of life that the present generation aspires to. Development should:

**Protect assets**

- Conserve and enhance the landscape character, historic landscape designated built environmental assets and their settings, and biodiversity of the environment making reference to the Environmental Character Assessment and green infrastructure strategy;
Other Planning Documents

There are other planning documents which specifically relate to Kettering Borough Council. These include Kettering Town Centre Area Action Plan and the East Kettering Strategic Design Supplementary Planning Document. However, these are area specific and the site does not fall within their boundaries.

There are no other policies or design guides which relate to listed buildings that are relevant to this site.
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Statutory List Descriptions
BRYN HAFOD

Grade II

Listed: 29-Sep-2004

House, at present Convent. Dated 1898. By J.A.Gotch for Charles Wicksteed. Red brick with stone dressings and plain-tile roof. Brick ridge and end stacks have unusual moulded stone entablature caps which incorporate up-draft enhancers. Seventeenth century Artisan Mannerist style with main windows of stone mullion and transom design with finely leaded casements. Secondary windows are sashes under stone lintels. 2 storeys and attic. Main front faces garden to rear, entrance front to right side, service front faces lane. This has a long front of sash windows with, to right, the fine large window of leaded casements which lights the staircase. Below are further leaded-light casements and, on right, is a facing gable again with leaded casements. The entrance front has the front door recessed within a curved moulded stone arch and has a projecting stack to right with initials and date CW 1898. To right and above are mullion and transom windows, and beyond the C20 chapel link is an unusual stone bow window. The garden front has four large gables facing and is a 6-window range at first floor over a centre-left garden door between 2-light windows and a large polygonal bay either side. These last have low stone balustrade caps. Window to right is a later careful insertion. Further service windows on the right end. INTERIOR. The entrance door leads to a vestibule and an inner door with finely leaded part-glazed door which leads to the large central hall with boxed cross-beamed ceiling all enriched with plasterwork and anaglypta decoration and frieze. Elaborate fireplace and overmantel and elaborate doors and fittings and half-height panelling. The staircases rises from the hall and returns to the landing above. Balustrade with reeded square balusters. Room to right of hall has C18 style fireplace. Drawing room behind has fine fireplace and overmantel and unusual low bow window as well as the large bay. At present a narrow strip has been partitioned off to form a passage leading to the chapel, but all the elaborate cornice survives. The dining room also has an elaborate fireplace and overmantel. A further reception room, facing the lane and perhaps a business room, has a C18 style fireplace with cast-iron grate. Bedrooms have been modified in some cases but many fireplaces with cast-iron grates and moulded doors survive as do the back stairs. This is a fine quality house by the distinguished architect J.A.Gotch, who was also an expert on C16 and C17 architecture. It was designed for Charles Wicksteed as his home and the patron specified that the house must have 'a central hall, easily cleared for dancing; there must be space for entertaining, and several spare rooms for guests.' Gotch provided this in a very effective manner and embellished the house with many fittings of quality. These have in very large part survived. Charles Wicksteed in a speech in 1923 said of the house 'A beautiful house, which had never been altered or repaired and was comfortable and beautiful in every way. Everything Mr.Gotch did was tasteful, beautiful, and good work'. Charles Wicksteed was a notable local businessman and a very generous benefactor to Kettering. He donated the large Wicksteed Park which continues to be one of the main leisure facilities of the town. He lived at Bryn Hafod until his death in 1931. The house became a Convent in the 1950's. The various extensions to the house including the remodelling of an early stable or service range which projects forward to the road, the chapel of 1963 (much remodelled in recent years), and the accommodation wing of the 1960's-70's are not of special architectural interest. Bryn Hafod forms a significant group with the former preparatory school (q.v.), aka Middlewest, next door.
OUR LADY'S CONVENT PREPARATORY SCHOOL
(Middlewest)

Grade II

Listed: 20-Jul-1977

Convent of Our Lady SP 87 NE 2/57 IT 2. Former preparatory school, built as a private house. Early C20. Probably by A. Bamford for a Mr.Berrill. Red brick ground floor and wide corner pilasters and pebbledash first floor. Wide elaborate modillion eaves cornice and hipped plain tile roof. Brick stack on left wing and possible truncated stack to right within flat of hipped roof. L plan. Carolean or Artisan Mannerist style with wooden or stone muillion and transom windows with fine leaded lights. 2 storeys and attics. Main front of house faces rear towards the garden. The entrance front towards the lane has the wing projecting on left. In section to right the entrance door has flat hood and 2-light windows either side and a large 5-light window over. Further stone windows to left and on left return, and on the front of the wing a window on the first floor over a door and blocked window. 3 2-light casement dormers with curved roofs on main range and another on the wing. Right side has further windows and a dormer above and left side has a triple window at first floor over sashes and 2 dormers over. Garden front is a symmetrical design of 6 windows at first floor over a polygonal bay either side a a central stone doorcase with stone window either side. 4 roof dormers, the outer of 2 lights with curved roofs, the inner of 3 lights with flat and pedimented roofs. INTERIOR. The entrance door leads to entrance hall with stone chequer floor from which leads an fine oak open-well staircase with column-on-vase balusters and massive column newels. Curving steps lead down under to cloaks which has black and white mini chequer floor and some original tiling. The entrance hall leads to a study on right with a c.1700 style fireplace and then down to the lounge hall which has an stone bolection fireplace. Original doors lead to the reception rooms which also have original fireplaces and to the service corridor. Bedrooms have original doors and fireplaces with cast-iron grates and one has become a second attic stair in addition to the back stairs. This house is a fine-quality essay in the Carolean style with little alteration to the interior which is carefully designed and has high quality fittings including excellent leaded-light windows. The house was mentioned by Pevsner in 1961 where it was mistakenly attributed to Gotch (q.v. Bryn Hafod, the Convent next door, with which Middlewest forms a group) but he specifically described this house. The classroom extension to north of c.1973 is not of special architectural interest. Sources Pevsner, N., Buildings of England, Northamptonshire, 1961, p.265. Northamptonshire Archaeology, Assessment and Building Evaluation for the Convent of Our Lady, Feb. 2003. including pers. comm. from RK Hardgrave re attribution to Bamford.
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Plans with Room Numbers