Damian Sullivan

From: [redacted]
Sent: 15 December 2014 18:23
To: Damian Sullivan
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: 9 Granville Road, Littlehampton

Importance: High

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Damian

Re: Proposed First Floor Extension (Including New First Floor Side Elevation Window), 9 Granville Road, Littlehampton
Ref: LU/333/14/HH

I refer to the above and our telephone conversation of 15th December 2014.

Having reviewed the progress of the planning application on line it would appear that the Historic Buildings Advisor has raised a number of issues regarding the project and I wanted to take the opportunity to consider the comments raised.

Prior to submitting the planning application, I was advised by the local planning authority that the property in question was not listed, and was not sited within a conservation area. As such it is my understanding that the property would retain its permitted development rights, thus enabling certain aspects of work to be carried out without the need for planning approval.

As part of this project I have submitted two applications to the Local Planning Authority – LU/333/14/HH, a full planning application for the first floor rear extension and the new side elevation window, and LU/335/14/CLP, a certificate of lawful use relating to those elements of the project which can be carried out without the need for planning consent.

I am of the opinion that the replacement windows, single storey rear extension, and re-rendering are classified as permitted development and as such do not require planning permission. The issues raised by the Historic Buildings Advisor relate solely to the works which do not require planning permission. It should be fully appreciated that we are not seeking planning consent for these replacement windows, re-rendering or single storey extension works, as these can be carried out without the need for planning consent. It is therefore the case that the local planning authority are unable to reject an application on aspects of work which can be carried out under permitted development rights.

The Historic Buildings Advisor is generally positive about the first floor rear extension, stating `the first floor extension is more successful`. The only aspect of concern for the Historic Buildings Advisor relating to the first floor extension is that the single storey extension projects beyond the corner of the two storey element. I would stress that this concern relates to the design of the single storey extension, which is being carried out under permitted development rights, rather than to the design of the first floor extension itself. I would also stress that the first floor extension projects only 3050mm from the original rear wall of the property and as such only marginally falls outside of permitted development rights itself.

I should also clarify that the neighbours properties have benefited from replacement upvc windows and many have been re-rendered.

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL LU/333/14/HH

To recap the Historic Buildings Advisor is raising issues with elements of the design which do not form part of this planning application, and which can be carried out without notification to, or approval from, the local planning authority. It would therefore be unfair and incorrect to reject this application based upon the comments which have been raised. I would ask that the Historic Buildings Advisor is asked to comment again on the proposals, but to restrict his comments to the aspect which we are seeking planning consent for. This corrected consultation should then ensure that the application is determined correctly, rather than a decision being made based upon an inaccurate consultation.

As discussed on the phone, it would be appreciated if I could discuss the matter in greater detail with you once you have had an opportunity to consider the consultation comments and review the application documents.

Many thanks

[redacted]

PMG
SurveyingPlanDrawingConsultancy

PMG LTD 10 ANNIVERSARY 2003-2013

[redacted]

RICS

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL LU/333/14/HH