

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

Application Number	AB/92/12/L
Address	33 Mount Pleasant, Arundel
Description	First and second floor extension and rear rooflights (amendments to AB/60/11/L).
Case Officer	Peter Cleveland
Site Visit	31 August 2012

Objection

33 Mount Pleasant is a characterful building of brick and flint construction which appears to date from the late Georgian period. It is situated on an elevated position abutting a large historic building to the south and is clearly visible from the street. Whilst it appears to have been extended to the north, this addition is largely subservient in scale and does not impede the appreciation of the main historic element. The roof is hipped at one end with a brick modillion cornice visible on the north and west elevations from the road.

The proposed addition to this, of a two storey element to the north is extremely problematic, not least because it harms the appreciation and understanding of the listed building's historic form and scale. The continuation of the ridge line at the existing height is never normally acceptable for this reason as it alters the character of the building, as does the change from a hipped roof to a gable. This is contrary to English Heritage practice guidance for PPS5 (still relevant to the NPPF), which states:

178. The main issues to consider in proposals for additions to heritage assets ..., are proportion, height, massing, bulk, use of materials, use, relationship with adjacent assets, alignment and treatment of setting.

In this instance the continuation of the roof form adds substantially to the building's massing at the north and in its elevated position will appear more imposing than it might otherwise. The addition also results in impacts such as the total loss of the north elevation and its cornice. A further concern here is the remnant of the earlier addition which is left to protrude slightly on the north elevation. The shallowness of this element is rather incongruous to the listed building and not appropriate. Another more minor issue is the first floor bathroom window which becomes part of the main fenestration and on plan at least appears largely unsympathetic.

Given the harmful impact of these changes on the heritage asset, proper justification is required to support them. As para 132 of the NPPF states:

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.

‘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.’

Here, the scheme results in the formation of a bathroom on the second floor and a toilet on the first floor. This seems generous given the impact of the extension on the heritage asset and the resulting change in character. For this reason and those above I am afraid the scheme cannot be supported.

Dr Ian Wightman
Historic Buildings Adviser