

**From:** Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses  
**Sent:** 22 December 2020 10:02  
**To:** Planning Scanning  
**Subject:** FW: Urgent - Case reference: AB/109/20/HH  
**Attachments:** Letter in response to clarification document.docx

Amanda Scholes | Receptionist, Department, Arun District Council | Location: Ground Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF  
Internal: 37736 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737500 ext 37736 | E-mail: amanda.scholes@arun.gov.uk

Visit Arun's web site at [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](#) • • • Save the environment - think before you print.

-----Original Message-----

From: Daun Johnson <Daun.Johnson@arun.gov.uk>  
Sent: 21 December 2020 15:00  
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>  
Cc: Zac Denton <Zac.Denton@arun.gov.uk>  
Subject: FW: Urgent - Case reference: AB/109/20/HH

rep

Daun Johnson  
Technical Support Unit Assistant, Planning

T: 01903 737762  
E: daun.johnson@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF [www.arun.gov.uk](http://www.arun.gov.uk)

[Sign up to our newsletter here](#)

-----Original Message-----

From: Alastair Smith [REDACTED]  
Sent: 21 December 2020 12:33  
To: Zac Denton <Zac.Denton@arun.gov.uk>; Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>  
Subject: Urgent - Case reference: AB/109/20/HH

Dear Zac,

I am writing to you having had then opportunity to give proper consideration to the changes to the original plan and subsequent clarification document.

In the light of the impact of current pandemic, along with much detail to examine, I appreciate that the letter will be received after the closing date for comment. However, I believe it should still be given due attention.

I would also like to know when you are planning on making a site visit to 36 King street and whether you will be bring any committee members?

Please find attached a letter in response to the 'Clarification document.'

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

Alastair

Dr Alastair Smith  
36 Kind street  
Arundel  
BN18 9BW

36 King Street  
Arundel  
BN18 9BW

20.12.2020

Arun District Council  
Planning Department

By email: [planning@arun.gov.uk](mailto:planning@arun.gov.uk), [Zac.Denton@arun.gov.uk](mailto:Zac.Denton@arun.gov.uk)

Case Officer: Mr Z Denton

**Case reference: AB/109/20/HH**

Reference: Agent Supporting Documents submitted 2/12/2020

Dear Mr Denton,

I am writing as I have significant concerns about the proposed development at 32 King street. As you will be aware, there have been modifications to the original plans submitted, along counter-arguments to objections, and extensions to the planning decision. Combine this with the disruptions caused by the pandemic, these have taken time to appropriately examine and respond in a considered manner. As such, I hope that Arun Planning Department will give relevant deliberation to this letter. It is a response to the 'Additional Clarification of Design Proposal for 32 King Street, Arundel' - submitted 02.12.2020. This document contains information that requires contextualising and thus requires further attention.

The document states in Paragraph 2 that the new proposed extension extends the property in a *similar manner* to the previous floor plan. This is factually incorrect. The proposed extension represents an entirely new layout and moves the new extension to the northern boundary line. The previous corridor and outbuilding had been designed in a manner that did not affect the adjacent 36 King street property which is Grade II listed. The contentious issue is not how far the proposed development extends to the east, rather how it now imposes at the northern boundary line. Whilst the now demolished garden room extended a further 3 metres to the east, it had been designed in a way that was sensitive to the unique conservation setting, being a suitable distance away from the listed property to the northern boundary to ensure no harm to structure or setting.

The argument that the 'top priority' of the new extension's design was the neighbour's right to light is wholly specious. Much is made in page 1, paragraph 5 and accompanying photo, that the new extensions roof will be 0.5 metres lower than the

previous roof. However, there is no reference to the fact that the previous roof was 4 metres away from the boundary line; whereas the new roof will be 50cm from the boundary line. It should also be noted that the existing mature beech hedge, of which nearly 7 meters will be removed, represents an entirely different barrier to the diffusion of light compared to the proposed wall and roof.

It is also important to highlight that (as stated page 3, final paragraph) whilst 34 King street was extended along the south length of 36 King street, this was done in a way that respected the neighbours right to light. Crucially, the eastern boundary of the 1950s 32-34 King street extension, stopped at the level of the window of the southern wall of 36 King street. This will not be respected with the proposed extension.

Page 2, paragraph 3, correctly affirms that 32 King street is not listed; however, it must be stressed that not only is it within the Arundel Conservation Area, it also nestled between two Grade II listed buildings to the northern and southern boundaries. It is also within 25 metres of the Grade I listed Arundel Cathedral. This is a historic and unique setting, different to the examples cited on page 2, and the proposed development directly affects the setting. It also increases the backfill and footprint of development within the Arundel Conservation Area.

Page 3 highlights the replacement of windows with conservation grade windows with improved energy efficiency. Whilst this appears a potentially positive feature, it is a distraction from the real issue of the proposed extension.

36 King street underwent extensive renovation in 2010. A key finding in the structural survey indicated the precarious state of the 230-year-old flint and mortar southern wall. This wall will be less than 2 metres from the substantial ground works required with the proposed extension. Indeed, significant remedial conservation work had to be undertaken to the southern wall, including a steel tie-in at first floor level and rod-plates at the south-western quoin. The proposed extension, in its current design, places an avoidable and unnecessary risk and potential harm to a Grade II listed property.

I hope that these points help to contextualise and provide some balance to those put forward in the 'Additional Clarification' document.

Yours sincerely

Dr Alastair Smith