

**ADC Planning Consultation
Response from the Historic Buildings Adviser**

Application Number	AB/62/12/L
Address	3 Mount Pleasant, Arundel
Description	Demolition of existing single storey kitchen extension and replacement with single storey extension to provide kitchen, utility and shower room.
Case Officer	James Smith
Site Visit	6 June 2012

Objection

There are two principal concerns with this scheme. The first is the removal of the rear ground floor wall and the second is the infilling of the garden with an increased extension.

The removal of the external wall is extremely problematic, not least because it involves an excessive loss of historic fabric from the main body of the listed building. This contravenes para. 179 of English Heritage guidance for PPS5 (still valid under the NPPF), which stipulates that:

'The fabric will always be an important part of the asset's significance. Retention of as much historic fabric as possible is therefore a fundamental part of any good alteration or conversion...'

Related to this is the partial loss of the plan which is eroded by the loss of the wall and the total opening up of the internal space. Whilst this is not a complex floor plan, its scale and modesty reflects the character of the building and the nature of its function as a small dwelling. The scope of the breach ignores this as well as results in the loss of original openings. Given the small scale of the building, this harm is considered significant and should be resisted. Para 182 of the same guidance clarifies that:

'The plan form of a building is frequently one of its most important characteristics and internal partitions, staircases and other features are likely to form part of its significance. ... Proposals to remove or modify internal arrangements, including the insertion of new openings or extension underground, will be subject to the same considerations of impact on significance ... as for externally visible alterations.'

With respect to the extension itself, the addition here is not considered overly detrimental in principle. The addition already takes up most of the courtyard and the space left is very small. The roof profile seems to be an improvement

Please note: The observations and comments expressed on this sheet are the views of the consultee concerned and are in no way binding on either the Council or its senior officers when making a decision on the application. Applicants or their agents should contact the case officer before acting on these views.

on the existing mono-pitch roof, but as shown in the 'existing' drawing, does not appear accurate. The pitch seems to be greater than that shown and in reality covers more of the rear elevation. A drop in the roof level here would be considered positive.

One further concern with the addition would be the detail and construction of the new wall in relation to the existing historic garden wall. We would want details of the new structure and a methodology of how this would be implemented without harming the historic fabric. This would of course be subject to the rear wall of the cottage being retained.

Ian Wightman
Historic Buildings Adviser