

Peter Cleveland

From: Robert Thornton [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 January 2013 17:31
To: Peter Cleveland
Cc: Heather Micklethwaite
Subject: 1212 Mount Pleasant, Arundel - Re: Planning Consultation on: AB/138/12/L & AB/137/12/
Attachments: 1212-402A Proposed Section.pdf

Peter,

I am happy that the amended plans submitted previously can be accepted as substitute for the purpose of securing an approval. Please find attached an updated section drawing removing reference to double glazing.

Regards,
Rob

Robert Thornton
Thornton architecture + design

T: 07773 245612 W: www.thornton-design.com

This e-mail is intended for the named addressee only. It contains information that may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the named addressee you may neither copy nor use nor disclose it to anyone else. If you have received it in error please notify us immediately and destroy the e-mail. The copyright of all files attached to this e-mail, unless stated otherwise, remain the property of Thornton Architecture + Design who grant licence to approved parties to utilize the data solely in connection with the project for which it was prepared.

From: Peter Cleveland
Sent: Friday, January 25, 2013 4:03 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Planning Consultation on: AB/138/12/L & AB/137/12/

Dear Mr Thornton

Please see Ian Wightmans comments below. Accordingly, please confirm that you are happy to provide the revised plans as substitutes to the submitted plans? Please note that the section plan still relates to the double glazing within the dormer window, please could this annotation be amended to allow for the plans to be formally accepted.

Kind regards
Peter

Peter Cleveland MSc | Senior Planner, Planning Department, Arun District Council | Location: 1st Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Internal: 37631 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737631 | E-mail: Peter.Cleveland@arun.gov.uk

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Ian Wightman [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 January 2013 15:31

To: Peter Cleveland
Cc: Martyn White
Subject: RE: Planning Consultation on: AB/138/12/L & AB/137/12/

Dear Peter,

Thank you for your email enclosing amendments and comments relating to 7 Mount Pleasant.

With regards to Mr Thornton's comments I would make the following points:

- The grade II designation does not remove the need for the building to be fully considered under current guidance and legislation.
- 'Group value' does not remove the need to consider the building's intrinsic values and potential special interest.
- List descriptions have traditionally been brief descriptions of appearance and are not exhaustive inventories of special interest.
- Under current guidance (2010), loss of fabric may be considered excessive where the plan is partly deleted and historic fabric lost without significant or compelling justification.
- PPS5 is relevant as the planning practice guide remains the Government endorsed document for the interpretation of the NPPF.
- The uncertainty over the chimney would tend to encourage retention as total removal has not been suitably qualified. Removal of some of the render to the rear of the chimney could help to assess its merits, particularly with regards to dating.
- The total removal of the chimney cannot reasonably be considered as a condition for 'any beneficial restoration'.
- The removal of historic fabric (especially external) cannot be justified on the desire for a particular amount of furniture (ie dining for 6).
- 'Normal practice' relates to retaining and promoting single glazing in historic buildings (with the exception of rooflights and conservatories) to maintain and improve building character.
- The quality of neighbouring windows do not constitute a precedent. Their improvement would also be sought in time, particularly for the benefit of 'group value'.
- It is difficult to justify double glazing on the basis of thermal performance, when the scheme proposes to open up and increase the ground floor and introduce a glass roof.
- It is noted that the bathroom door is not in the original position, however it does hinge off the wall as the original is likely to have done.

Given the above comments, I would add that the new opening we have agreed to is considered a compromise. It should be remembered that the compartmental nature of many historic buildings can contribute towards the control of thermal performance and reduce the spread of fire, particularly where kitchens are concerned.

With respect to the amended plans, these can now be supported. As mentioned above, further exploration of the chimney might shed some light on its date and origin.

Kind regards,

Ian

Dr Ian Wightman
Historic Buildings Adviser -
Design & Implementation
Chichester District Council

From: Peter Cleveland [<mailto:Peter.Cleveland@arun.gov.uk>]
Sent: 16 January 2013 14:45
To: Ian Wightman
Subject: FW: Planning Consultation on: AB/138/12/L & AB/137/12/

Hi Ian

Please see attached from Mr Thornton. I spoke with him briefly today, he is wanting you to re-consider your comments in line with the attached detail and commentary upon your response. In particular, they wish to retain the double glazing, opening up of the internal wall and removal of the chimney.

I'm around most of the day to discuss if you are free.

Regards

Peter

Peter Cleveland MSc | Senior Planner, Planning Department, Arun District Council | Location: 1st Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37631 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737631 | E-mail: Peter.Cleveland@arun.gov.uk

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Robert Thornton [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 January 2013 14:24
To: Peter Cleveland
Subject: Re: Planning Consultation on: AB/138/12/L & AB/137/12/

Dear Peter,

Please find attached alternate plans, section and elevation drawings for your consideration and comment. Please note that these are not yet issued to you as substitute planning drawings, so please do not add them to your web pages before we have discussed their acceptability.

Please also find attached our return comments on your Historic Building Adviser's Report and summaries of the relevant National Planning Policies and English Heritage Policies & Guidance.

When you have had a chance to review this additional information, I would welcome the opportunity to discuss the matter further with you.

Regards,

Robert Thornton

Thornton architecture + design

[REDACTED]

This e-mail is intended for the named addressee only. It contains information that may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the named addressee you may neither copy nor use nor disclose it to anyone else. If you have received it in error please notify us immediately and destroy the e-mail. The copyright of all files attached to this e-mail, unless stated otherwise, remain the property of Thornton Architecture + Design who grant licence to approved parties to utilize the data solely in connection with the project for which it was prepared.

From: Peter Cleveland
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2013 8:55 AM
To: 'Robert Thornton'
Subject: RE: Planning Consultation on: AB/138/12/L & AB/137/12/

Dear Robert

Thank you for this confirmation. With regards the substitute plans; the sooner you can get them sent in the better really so that I can then discuss them with Ian Wightman. I am in the office all day today and Ian also so I can either ring you later or please contact me on the number below when you are free.

Kind regards
Peter

Peter Cleveland MSc | Senior Planner, Planning Department, Arun District Council | Location: 1st Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37631 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737631 | E-mail: Peter.Cleveland@arun.gov.uk

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Robert Thornton [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 January 2013 08:51
To: Peter Cleveland
Subject: Re: Planning Consultation on: AB/138/12/L & AB/137/12/

Peter,

Thank you for this report from Dr I Wightman. There are some matters I would like to discuss further. In anticipation, we have prepared substitute drawings, which should meet your requirements. However, please could you let us know what your timetable is for receipt of substitute drawings and when would be best to contact you to discuss our response?

Regards,
Robert Thornton
Thornton architecture + design

[REDACTED]

This e-mail is intended for the named addressee only. It contains information that may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the named addressee you may neither copy nor use nor disclose it to anyone else. If you have received it in error please notify us immediately and destroy the e-mail. The copyright of all files attached to this e-mail, unless stated otherwise, remain the property of Thornton Architecture + Design who grant licence to approved parties to utilize the data solely in connection with the project for which it was prepared.

From: Peter Cleveland
Sent: Tuesday, January 15, 2013 9:18 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Planning Consultation on: AB/138/12/L & AB/137/12/

Dear Mr Thornton

Please find attached Ian Wightmans response to the above application. As you will see, some amendments will be required in order to gain a favourable recommendation for the works. Once you have had time to review the required amendments, please contact me to discuss the recommended changes so that we can agree a way forward.

Kind regards
Peter

Peter Cleveland MSc | Senior Planner, Planning Department, Arun District Council | Location: 1st Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37631 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737631 | E-mail: Peter.Cleveland@arun.gov.uk