

Simon Davis

From: 
Sent: 10 December 2014 10:52
To: 'Douglas Briggs Partnership'
Subject: RE: 6807b: Sefter Farm Applications P/99/14 & P/105/14

Dear Mr Hughes,

I have spoken again with Dr Ian Wightman and he has provided the following additional comments (which will shortly be on our website):

"Thank you for the email and amended drawing which I have discussed with Martyn White and Daniel Vick. Whilst we acknowledge that the material from the historic wall will be re-used, this rarely mitigates harm to the extent that would be required here. As the historic mapping shows, the new building will still encroach heavily into the old farm yard and the scale of it is likely to be significant within the setting of the listed building. To say this does not represent an element of harm (at whatever level) would be negligent on our part and would not meet the requirements of paras 129, 132 and 137 of the Framework. We did have a very useful meeting on site with the MD Mr Julian Marks and he did explain the reasons for the extension so we are aware of the justification. This however would have to be considered in the broader planning balance in terms of potential public benefit etc (para 134 of the Framework)."

I have been requested by Cllr Dawn Hall to take this to Committee if I am going to recommend refusal and the next Committee is the 28th January. My plan therefore is to take it to that Cttee with a recommendation to refuse. However, you have time before I write the report up to prepare a counter argument if you so wish. In particular you might like to make a case as to why it is essential to site the extension in this location, why it cannot go elsewhere on the site and why it cannot be an alternative shape (as previously suggested to you).

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI, Principal Planning Officer, Development Control
Arun District Council (First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF)
Telephone: +44 (0)1903 737874
Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk
P Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Douglas Briggs Partnership 
Sent: 08 December 2014 11:16
To: Simon Davis
Cc: 
Subject: Re: 6807b: Sefter Farm Applications P/99/14 & P/105/14

Dear Mr Davis,

We can amend the revised plan as you have requested but need to clarify what you require.

To explain the changes;

The existing plan 6807a-001A shows the location of a mound on the area of land adjacent to the former orchard with a timber fence on its North side. The level of this ground is higher than the loading yard and you will notice an existing bank running between the building to be extended and Drizzle Store to be replaced, indicating the change in

levels between this land and the loading yard.

The initial submitted plans 6807a-101D included a new retaining wall adjacent to the path along the North side of the proposed extension to account for this change in levels.

The revised plan submitted 6807a-101E substitutes the new retaining wall with a bank and fence (relocated from its previous position shown on drawing 6807a-001A) between points B-Y.

The existing wall A-B is shown as demolished on both the initially submitted drawing 6807a-101D and the revised plan submitted 6807a-101E.

As Mr Wightman had suggested in his consultation response, the material reclaimed from this demolition will be used to repair the sections of retained wall from B-C and C-D, as indicated on the revised drawing 6807a-101E.

It is not possible to tell exactly how much material will be able to be reclaimed and thus the exact extent of the repairs which can be made to the retained sections of wall, but as Mr Wightman had noted, the retained section of wall includes several areas of unsympathetic repair that the revised proposals aim to rectify.

Please let us know how you wish the revised plan to be amended to make this any clearer.

With kind regards

Paul Hughes

Douglas Briggs Partnership

Flint Barns

Ham Farm

Bosham

West Sussex PO18 8EH

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

This email and any attachments is intended for the person to whom it is addressed.

If an addressing or transmission error has misdirected this email, please notify the author.

If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, copy, print, redistribute or rely on this email.

Simon Davis

From: Simon Davis
Sent: 27 November 2014 10:20
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Sefter Farm Applications P/99/14 & P/105/14

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write in respect of the two current Sefter Farm applications that you have submitted. I have now received comments from our Historic Buildings Adviser for both applications. These are on our website but I paste them below for ease:

Ref P/99/14

"No Objection. The proposed addition is a reasonable distance from the listed building and whilst visible, is unlikely to greatly conflict with the experience of the heritage asset given the current setting."

Ref P/105/14

"No Objection subject to amendment

This scheme seeks to extend on application P/99/14/L by proposing a further larger addition to the south. The width of the proposed building is such that it results in a higher ridge level, but also appears to produce a structure of considerable bulk and massing. Seen in context with the listed building, it is likely to represent a level of harm to its appreciation and thus its setting.

A more direct impact is the loss of a section of wall and encroachment into the historic farm yard which is evident on historic mapping. This wall is of interest as a farm boundary, as well as being made up of various materials including, flint, brick and what appears to be Bognor rock. Other areas of the wall have already been replaced by brick sections meaning that any surviving sections may be considered to be of greater value.

The issue of setting is slightly complicated by existing commercial buildings to the west, one of which would be demolished, however seen purely as impact, there has to be an acceptance here that a level of harm to the listed building and its setting would be created by the scheme and as such conflicts with paras 131 and 132 of the Framework.

It should be noted that the value of setting is not reliant on public amenity or access, nor is screening by plants or trees recognized in historic environment terms, as an appropriate means of mitigation. Any impacts should be designed out wherever possible. Similarly, the loss of the historic wall is not ideal given its relationship to the heritage asset and contribution to the site more generally. The re-use of the materials elsewhere does little to mitigate this, though if this were to happen, repairs to the existing boundary would be perhaps more satisfactory than forming a stone boundary that did not formerly exist and might be misconstrued. The preservation of setting is sought under para 137 of the Framework.

Given these concerns, we would suggest a compromise in which the proposed building was reduced to approximately half its size to reduce massing in the setting, but also avoid the loss of the wall and courtyard. A smaller building, or component of the extension could be maintained where the current building is located and would be approximately the same size. This would provide about 75% of the proposed floor area, though obviously less cubic volume. If this is not feasible then justification for the proposal should be considered in potentially broader terms in accordance with para 134 of the Framework."

--

I therefore write to ask whether your clients would be amenable to the changes proposed in respect of P/105/14. Although I have not yet formulated my recommendation, I would not be inclined to go against the advice of our Historic Buildings Adviser. Please note that I consider that there is scope to amend the current application and not to have to withdraw and resubmit.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI, Senior Planning Officer, Development Control
Arun District Council (First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF)
Telephone: +44 (0)1903 737874
Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk
P Save the environment - think before you print.