

Simon Davis

Y/59/13/

From: Simon Davis
Sent: 28 November 2013 10:25
To: 'Paul Clarke'
Subject: RE: Hobbs Court Bilsham Road, Yapton, Arundel. Y/59/13/ and Y/60/13/L
Attachments: Hobbs Court, Yapton.doc

Dear Paul,

I have now received comments from our Historic Buildings Adviser. These will be on our website soon but I attach for your convenience. As you will read, objections have been raised. Given that the application time period expires on the 2nd December, I cannot accept any further amendments or enter into any negotiation on the objections and will need to refuse the application unless your client is amenable to withdrawing both and then resubmitting?

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI, Senior Planning Officer, Development Control
Arun District Council (First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF)

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk

P Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Paul Clarke
Sent: 27 November 2013 10:46
To: Simon Davis
Cc: Martyn White
Subject: RE: Hobbs Court Bilsham Road, Yapton, Arundel. Y/59/13/ and Y/60/13/L

Many thanks.
No more changes

Regards

Paul Clarke
Director

PDK Architecture and Surveying

www.pdkconsulting.co.uk

29 Breach Avenue, Southbourne, Emsworth, Hampshire. PO10 8NB.

This e-mail is confidential. If you receive it by mistake, please inform us immediately and delete it from your system. You should not copy, disclose, or distribute its contents to anyone nor act in reliance on this e-mail, as this is prohibited and may be unlawful.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Simon Davis
Sent: 27 November 2013 09:59
To: 'Paul Clarke'
Cc: Martyn White
Subject: RE: Hobbs Court Bilsham Road, Yapton, Arundel. Y/59/13/ and Y/60/13/L

Hi Paul,

I have looked at the differences and on the basis that no new openings are proposed, I consider we can accept these as an amendment. However, given that the determination date is next week, this has to be the last change.

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI, Senior Planning Officer, Development Control
Arun District Council (First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF)

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk

P Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Paul Clarke
Sent: 27 November 2013 09:25
To: Simon Davis
Cc: Martyn White; 'Tom';
Subject: RE: Hobbs Court Bilsham Road,Yapton,Arundel. Y/59/13/ and Y/60/13/L

Simon

Sorry to be a pain but in confusion with Andrew being on paternity leave the East windows and doors on Tyne barn were agreed to be altered on site to remove the glazed central double doors and replace the high level window like for like in existing location, reposition the timber door mirrored on the elevation and provide glazed door in doors original location. Can these alterations also be included in the alterations to the approval.
Updated plan 002B and elevations 008B attached

Regards

Paul Clarke
Director

PDK Architecture and Surveying

29 Breach Avenue. Southbourne. Emsworth. Hampshire. PO10 8NB.

This e-mail is confidential. If you receive it by mistake, please inform us immediately and delete it from your system. You should not copy, disclose, or distribute its contents to anyone nor act in reliance on this e-mail, as this is prohibited and may be unlawful.
Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Paul Clarke
Sent: 20 November 2013 08:46
To: 'Simon Davis'
Cc: 'Martyn White'; 'Tom';
Subject: RE: Hobbs Court Bilsham Road,Yapton,Arundel. Y/59/13/ and Y/60/13/L

Simon

Sorry for confusion, On Cottars plan revision 005 A was to alter windows mentioned but was revised following day by rev B.

Typical window detail also attached

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

Application Number	Y/59/13 & Y/60/13/L <del> </del>
Address	Hobbs Court, Yapton
Description	Revisions to Y/3/89, Y/4/89 and Y/60/90
Case Officer	Simon Davis
Site Visit	Previous

Objection

Whilst the principle of conversion is acceptable, there are a number of proposed alterations which will, incrementally, erode the character of this agricultural group and as a consequence are likely to harm the setting of the listed building adjacent. There is also issue with the position of the staircase in Tryne Barn which is not acceptable and requires more than a simple amendment. For this reason and that above, a straight 'objection' has been raised to give weight to the amendments required. Once these are remedied, the scheme can be supported. They are as follows:

Tryne Barn

- Staircases in the threshing areas of barns are normally avoided to allow this important space to be expressed more fully. Ideally, the staircase should be located to the side of this space.
- The rooflight to the WC is located in the corner of the roof and as such does not appear sympathetic with the building. Given the low importance of this room, the rooflight should be omitted.
- The rooflight to the study does not appear justified given the level of light here. This should be omitted.
- One of the two rooflights on the front elevation should be removed as this currently appears overly domestic. Two lights are also excessive for the width of the room. If a further light is required, it should be in the rear slope, further to the omission of those proposed (see above).

Cotters

- The proposed 'lights' either side of the French doors in the south west elevation should be omitted. These are overly domestic in this context and do not retain the character of the former outbuilding.

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.

- The French doors to the north east elevation are also an inappropriate design and should be amended to be more sympathetic with the building.

The Dove Cott

- The number of rooflights in the roof-scape appear excessive for the size and again are overly domestic in this context. Those on the north west roof slope should be omitted.
- The first floor windows in the south east elevation of the main building should be multi-paned. These would be more sympathetic and less domestic than the split pane windows proposed. They are also quite large for the elevation.

Window Detail

- A detail of a 20mm double-glazed unit with stuck on glazing bars has been proposed in the application. This is not acceptable. Small windows, especially multi-paned, should use a slim window system in traditionally built frames.

Ian Wightman
Historic Buildings Adviser

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.