

Hannah Riddle

From: Maria Tomalova
Sent: 03 August 2022 12:14
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: P/59/22/L - Pennicotts Farm - Email 1 of 3
Attachments: 0971 - Window Schedule - V3.pdf; 971 - Pennicotts Farm - Issue 27 1-4 ListedBuilding Amenity Treatment copy.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Please upload the below and attached to the above application; further information.

Maria Tomalova
Senior Planning Officer
Directorate of Place

T: 01903 737510
E: maria.tomalova@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk



From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 August 2022 10:33
To: Maria Tomalova <Maria.Tomalova@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Martyn White <Martyn.White@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: P/59/22/L - Pennicotts Farm - Email 1 of 3

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Dear Maria,

Thank you for the feedback. I respond to the Conservation Officer's comments as follows, with attached amended plans and window schedule (sent in 3 emails because of file size)

If anything is still unclear or cannot be dealt with by means of a condition then I would welcome a conversation directly with the Conservation Officer if that is appropriate.

External works

1. Repointing - The existing Lime mortar will be analysed and lime mortar colour and consistency comparisons will be conducted so as to ensure a perfect match to the existing. To enable an even / equal bed depth, the existing lime mortar will be raked out by traditional manual tool, on a block of wood. No rotating blades or machinery will be used, so as to ensure the bricks are not damaged.
2. Unit B rear garden porch - It is confirmed that the existing porch is to be maintained - as confirmed on the attached revisions to the drawing set.
3. Rainwater goods - The materials and colour of all rainwater goods will be as per the front elevation, i.e. dark grey (RAL 7016), as confirmed on the attached revisions to the drawing set.

4. Details of wall vents - the position of the proposed wall vents are indicated on Drg. B620, and their detail is provided within the sections DT02 and DT21 of Drg. B900.

Internal works

1. Door A-GD-13 - It is clarified that wall infill and door removal will be as per the DD Section in Drg.B850, as confirmed on the attached revisions to the drawing set.

2. Any removed doors will be re-used elsewhere within the building, or if they cannot be put to good use they will be kept and stored within the building thereafter.

3. Insulation - The proposed insulation measures have been designed to enable the building to breathe.

4. Unit B lounge window - there is currently no window and this arrangement is maintained.

Windows

1. The replacement window double glazing will be 12-14mm thick, and this is clarified on the attached revisions to the drawing set.

2. The window and door schedule is attached. The refurbished existing windows are to be internally double glazed with separate UPVC window. This maintains the external appearance and provides perfect U-Values.

Boundary Treatment

3. For now the garden is to remain undivided, although the Applicant may choose to plant a hedge to afford some privacy between the two properties. This does not require Listed Building Consent. If, in due course a fence is proposed to be installed the appropriate Consent will be sought in advance of any works taking place.

I trust this clarifies all the outstanding matters, and I trust that a consent can be expeditiously granted, as the Applicant is now keen to bring these properties back into a habitable condition as soon as possible. Any further delays will seriously undermine the capability of the Applicant, a farmer, in undertaking the works.

Regards,

Warren Pierson
PD Planning UK Ltd



On 1 Jul 2022, at 19:55, Maria Tomalova <Maria.Tomalova@arun.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Mr Pierson,

Please see below the comments of ADC Principal Conservation Officer.

In Conclusion he requires further information:

'At present, there are a few questions/issues that need to be considered before I can fully conclude on the impacts of the proposal. If these can be dealt with, I believe that there is potential for the scheme to be acceptable and not cause harm.'

Kind regards

Maria

Maria Tomalova
Senior Planning Officer
Directorate of Place
<image007.jpg>
T: 01903 737510
E: maria.tomalova@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltrovers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

From: Martyn White <Martyn.White@arun.gov.uk> **On Behalf Of** Conservation Officer

Sent: 01 July 2022 17:29

To: Maria Tomalova <Maria.Tomalova@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: P/59/22/L

P/59/22/L

Pennicotts Farm Pagham Road Pagham PO20 1LN

Listed Building consent for works associated with refurbishment of property pursuant to Listed Building Consent reference P/123/20L for the demolition of existing conservatory to southern side of building & general repair & maintenance of external brickwork & roof coverings, replacement windows etc. Internal alterations comprising the removal of partition walls, reinstatement of wooden balustrade to staircase, and general repair, maintenance and refurbishment.

Pennicotts Farm is a grade II C18 Listed Building. It is a detached, two storey 'L' shaped building with a rearwards arm along its southern side. It is of Red brick construction. The main entrance porch centrally placed within the western frontage, along with a simple porch. Attached to the northern side of the main building are several single storey brick elements with pitched roofs, and a modern glazed conservatory structure to the front, in line with the front elevation.

The rearwards arm of the building also has a series of single storey structures with mono-pitch roofs attached to its southern side and a single storey brick/stone "coal store" at its far end. The additions to the side include another modern conservatory addition, brick porch and entrance door, accessed by a path and gap through the southern boundary wall.

The building is sadly in a poor state of repair clearly having had little maintenance in recent years, which is disappointing. It is noted that the Design and Access and heritage statement identifies that internally it has long been divided and altered to enable its use as two separate houses. There are also two modern, and inappropriate conservatories which detract from the significance of the listed building

The poor state of repair means that the building is potentially a candidate for being classified as a heritage building "at risk". However, despite its poor condition, it is considered to be of architectural significance.

The proposal

The proposal is to undertake extensive works in order to put the building back into an acceptable state of repair so that it can be used as originally intended, a home. Whilst a lot of information has been provided, it would have helped if it could have been provided so that the existing plans,

proposed areas of demolition and proposed plans were separate. It has taken some time to try and understand the extent of the works requested. However, based on what I have been able to determine, I provide the following comments:

Externally

Externally, the demolition of the modern conservatories is positive proposal as it will remove two extensions that harm the significance of the building. Further, this element will ensure that a more appropriate elevation is returned to view.

Works that involve the general repair and maintenance of external brickwork and roof coverings are acceptable subject to the nature of the works and materials to be used. Details of the repointing will be required – for instance how will the existing mortar be removed, what will the replacement mortar be (i.e. will it be based on an analysis of existing) and how will it look (i.e. appearance). Such information can be provided for by way of condition, if you approve the application.

Can it be confirmed if unit B is to have a replacement rear conservatory or new porch? Both references appear on the various plans. For instance, the plan titled 'GF Plan Structures refers to 'new conservatory replace existing', whereas the proposed rear elevation plan refers to 'Garden Porch'.

Details of the rainwater goods will be required in terms of their appearance, materials and colour (the front elevation identifies it to be 7016 'grey', where as a side elevation has it as 'black').

details of the stainless-steel wall vents, which I am unable to locate.

Internally

Internally, the alterations relate to the formulation of two formal dwellings and comprise of: the removal of some partition walls, reinstatement of wooden balustrade to staircase, along with general repair, maintenance and refurbishment. Whilst the loss of the internal walls will result in the loss of some historic fabric, and potentially affect the historic layout of the building, it has been identified in the heritage statement that previous internal alterations have already taken place. The proposed layout will allow for the building to be put back into use, and therefore be maintained, which is positive.

There remains some inconsistency in the plans – I note that door A-GD 13 is to be removed on the floor plans (GF Plan Structure) and replaced with 'new infill walls', but the plans 'House B Staircase D-D section' indicates that the same door is to be fixed shut. Which is correct?

There is also another door which will be blocked up and the door recycled, but it is also not clear from the various plans what would happen to the 're-cycled' doors.

References and drawings identify that insulation is to be 'injected into the walls and then new plaster added. It is not clear how such an approach will allow the building to 'breathe'. It is also not clear how the existing laths and studs will be maintained, but a Newton membrane added to the rear of the wall – please forgive me if I have misinterpreted the plans!

However, there are also some positive elements to the proposal where I note in the Design and Access Statement the fact that the works seek to retain and repair/refurbish the internal architectural detailing that may be present, including fireplaces that will remain in situ, floors and skirting boards, architraves and mouldings.

Out of interest, I also notice that the lounge for unit B will not have any form of window – is this correct?

Windows

Windows are an important feature within a listed building, and their replacement should be carefully considered. Good practice is that existing windows should be retained and repaired prior to their wholesale replacement. As previously noted, whilst double glazing could be accepted, they should be of the slimmer units, as opposed to the standard ones. It is clear from looking at the plans (Window details DWG No971-B891 Rev E) that the double-glazed units will be of a standard design (such as 24-28mm), as opposed to the slimmer design (such as 12-14mm). As previously identified, the use of the standard design, and measurements will not be supported. However, I also note in the Heritage Statement in paragraph 4.3 that it states, “Notably the replacement windows are of a heritage style design with 12-14mm units, thereby addressing the previous reason for refusal”. If this is the case, then surely the plans should be amended to reflect this! If this is the case, and can be confirmed, the slimmer units can be accepted.

It also appears from the floor plans that only some of the windows will be replaced. Am I correct in assuming that only the new windows will have the double glazing, or is the intention to retrofit the existing windows that will be refurbished etc as well? If it is the latter, will the existing windows be able to accommodate the new glazing, or will they need to be amended? Also, I believe that I saw a reference to a window schedule, but am unable to locate this.

Boundary Treatment

Details of how the garden is to be divided up is also required. At present it is not clear what sort of walling or fencing etc. would be used and how this would look. Details could be provided for by way of condition.

Conclusion

At present, there are a few questions/issues that need to be considered before I can fully conclude on the impacts of the proposal. If these can be dealt with, I believe that there is potential for the scheme to be acceptable and not cause harm.

Martyn White
Principal Conservation Officer, Planning

Please note: I work on Conservation for half of the working week – all day Monday and Friday and Tuesday afternoons only.

T: 01903 737717
E: Martyn.white@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd
Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

<image001.jpg> <image002.jpg> <image003.jpg>

<image004.jpg>

<http://www.arun.gov.uk>

DX 57406 Littlehampton

You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from <https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.
