

Planning, Design, Access and Heritage Statement

The Royal Oak, Langstone Harbour

Addendum April 2014

Council Reference: APP/14/00053 & 54

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Following initial consideration of the application and comments received from third parties, planning officers requested a meeting with the applicants to discuss possible design amendments.

2.0 REVISED DESIGN

- 2.1 It was acknowledged by the Chichester Harbour Conservancy (in their undated letter of representation) that the extract flue is “only really visible from the pub garden and neighbour’s property to the west”. Planning officers agreed this to be the case.
- 2.2 The Council’s conservation officer remained concerned that the duct was a potentially discordant feature for the Listed Building.
- 2.3 Accepting that there are no material views of the proposed external to the site but that it does nonetheless impact on the Listed Building itself, the applicants agreed to reconsider the possibility of a screening structure. It is therefore imperative that the screening structure itself does not make the scheme more widely visible or attract more attention than the functional appearance of the duct itself.
- 2.4 The draft proposal referred to in the original D&AS (para 4.5) was explained to be unacceptable to the applicants as it would double the overall cost of the project. That proposal required a load bearing structure in order to carry the then suggested tile

roof. The elaboration and cost of that screening solution was out of proportion to the cost and to the benefits.

- 2.5 Alternative, simpler solutions have therefore been explored.
- 2.6 In exploring alternative solutions it became apparent that the originally proposed “flattening” of the duct serves no materially useful purpose as a similarly shaped screening structure would merely attract attention due to its unorthodox shape.
- 2.7 In considering a simplified screening structure the applicants therefore also considered a simplification of the duct itself and eliminated the flattened section.
- 2.8 The size of fan needed to draw the kitchen extract and force it through a silencer is determined by calculation but any fan will describe a circular motion and therefore need to be housed in a square or cylindrical housing.
- 2.9 Inclusion of the flattened section of duct therefore required a “taper” to get the duct back to the square proportions needed for the fan.
- 2.10 Elimination of the flattened section therefore also allows the taper to be eliminated from the scheme thereby reducing the overall amount of ductwork on the roof.
- 2.11 The applicants have therefore retained a square section duct on the rear flat roof (reducing the extent of the ductwork) and now propose to screen this with a simple lightweight structure.
- 2.12 The screening structure will comprise sloping feather edged boarding sides supported on a simple galvanised steel frame which can be held in place with sand bags.
- 2.13 The screen unifies and simplifies the appearance of the duct but does not offer any material level of acoustic attenuation. The scheme therefore retains the same proposal for an acoustic jacket for the duct work and the same specification of silencer. The Acoustic Report has been reviewed and confirms the recommendations and conclusions to achieve the improved performance, see attached.

3.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 3.1 The revised scheme remains “only really visible from the pub garden and neighbours property to the west” and now lessens any impact on the Listed Building itself by improving the appearance and significantly lessening the amount of duct work.
- 3.2 The previously proposed significant improvements in the acoustic performance of the proposal compared to existing remain just the same.
- 3.3 The benefits of providing a means to ventilate the commercial kitchen and allow the pub to continue as a viable enterprise remain.
- 3.4 With the simplified screening solution the proposal remains as a viable and acceptable solution to the applicants.
- 3.5 The revised proposal should be approved.