





From: Ben Kirk 
Sent: 16 June 2018 16:23
To: Simon Davis
Subject: BN/22/18/PD

BN/22/18/PD

Notification for Prior Approval under Class Q for a Proposed Change of Use of Agricultural Building to 2No. Dwellinghouses (Class C3) and associated works

Land North of Sunnyside Cottages Yapton Road Barnham PO22 0AZ

Simon

With regards to the above application, I note the comments available on line from the Parish Council and your email exchanges.

I wish to make a number of comments on the points raised by the Parish Council.

As you are aware this is a prior notification application and not an application that requires consultation with the parish council. It appears the reason the parish wish to raise an objection is that one of the councillors lives next to the site, the comments are therefore not considered representative of the parishes view had there not have been this personal interest in the development.

Whilst I note you are not obliged to take the parish councils views in to account, they have nonetheless made comments and I wish to provide some clarity on these.

As you are aware, Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the GPDO establishes the principle of development and limits the matters that can be considered as part of the application, therefore the comments relating to the previous application for 3 dwellings which was refused and dismissed are entirely irrelevant.

With regards to the comments regarding the structure of the building and its footings, as you will have seen from your site visit the building is a robust metal frame and sits on good quality foundations and a small plinth upstand, it is in this respect considerably more robust than numerous agricultural buildings that have been granted consent under class Q elsewhere. The comments relating to the use of Celotex are a complete nonsense, this is a product used in nearly all new build dwellings and is fully compliant with building regulations. Timber cladding is clearly also compliant and can be fire treated. Notwithstanding this these issues are clearly not a material planning consideration in this matter.

The drainage on site is perfectly adequate for a connection and this can be controlled by condition if required, we have engaged a drainage consultant on this matter and are certain this is entirely practical. Comments relating to street lighting and footpaths are not a matter that can be considered under class Q

There is adequate parking for both dwellings in line with WSSCC standards and the garden space is the maximum allowed under class Q so these comments are again unfounded.

Finally, I would like to dispute the comments that the building will look like an army barracks and is unattractive. I would remind you of your comments in your report for application BN/61/16/PL for a new build dwelling where you stated that "Furthermore, it is considered that the building design and materials (timber cladding/clay tiles) are appropriate to this rural location." – it is clear that a similar conclusion should be reached here.

I trust you will take our comments in to account

Kind Regards

Ben Kirk
Msc Timber Building Conservation
Managing Director

Manorwood
Studio 5
Chilgrove Business Centre
Chilgrove
Nr Chichester
West Sussex
PO18 9HU

