

HM/29740
9th April 2013

Planning Department
Havant Borough Council
Civic Offices
Civic Centre Road
Havant
Hampshire
PO9 2AX

Dear Mr Eaves

**Ref: Homewell House, Havant
APP/13/00061**

Following comments received from the Conservation Consultant for the above mentioned project we respond as follows;

Reference is made to the windows and detailing in the proposed extension being poorer than the previously permitted scheme. During our pre-application meeting the size of the windows were discussed and as a result we increased the size of them for the current submission, we had thought that this had been agreed as subsequent drawings were issued to yourselves for further comments. We are happy to increase the size of these windows further from 1350mm deep to 1500mm and trust that this will be acceptable to yourselves. With regards to the detailing, this has always been as per the previous approved scheme so without further clarification we believe our current proposals should be acceptable.

Mr Townsend's letter then goes on to comment on the proposed internal layouts, particularly with regards to flats 10 and 11 and that he considers the Heritage Statement to be inadequate in this regards.

We have previously discussed with yourselves the necessity to achieve 14 one person, one bedroom flats for this development. Unfortunately this is not negotiable, our client Havant Housing Association have obtained H.C.A funding for a development of this size within Havant. The flats must be designed to achieve minimum Government H.Q.I space standards and these cannot be compromised. The scheme is supported by your own Housing Department.

If it was possible to redesign the layout of the existing ground floor still achieving the areas required we would but unfortunately this is not possible. We have taken other measures to improve the overall appearance of the building and to reinstate it back to how it formerly was, and the ground floor proposals can be reversed at a later date if required however it seems that no weight has been given to this.

In respect of Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework it is not considered that the proposed internal alterations would result in substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset that is the listed building (Paragraph 133). If it is thought that less than substantial harm would result from the alterations proposed to the ground floor layout then, in accordance with Paragraph 134, the public benefits of the proposal should be weighed, including securing the optimum viable use.

It is considered that clear public benefits would result from the proposed development that is the provision of much needed affordable residential accommodation for disadvantaged

single people in the borough. Furthermore, retaining the entire in one ownership would enable more effective management than for the permitted scheme where the ownership would be more disparate and consequently there would be more potential for neglect and misuse.

Although there would be some compromising of the internal space, no loss of historic fabric would occur. We are proposing that one of the doors and the frame and architraves to both openings would be retained. Furthermore the unusual internal shutters to the two front facing ground floor windows would be repaired and made functional. The internal alterations we propose are reversible, allowing the ground floor layout in particular, to be re-instated at some time in the future should the need arise.

There seems to be no issues with the first floor. A pair of doors and architraves on the second floor seems to be of concern. We are unsure as to which doors these comments refer to as there are three matching four panel doors located within this floor. Although these doors might be original they are of very poor quality and this floor would have been allocated for the servants hence the poor standard. Our Client is happy to retain all three of these doors and associated architraves, however they would have to be relocated within the listed building and used on bathroom doors as all other doors would have to be fire rated to comply with the Building Regulations. It is our intention that all new doors would then have a similar profile to these but would be fire doors.

Again the two doors on the ground floor seem to be of concern, although we do not believe these to be original we are proposing to retain one of these in its current position however the second one would either have to be stored or moved to become a bathroom door within the downstairs flat as in any other position it would have to be fire rated, which they currently are not.

As mentioned above we feel the current proposals the subject of this application have improved significantly on the current approved scheme in producing a solution that brings Homewell back to how it formerly was, as follows;

1. The removal of two inappropriate horizontal-emphasis windows on the west elevation and infilling with matching brickwork.
2. Restoration of a single semi-circular headed window, also on the west elevation following the removal of the two existing unsympathetic windows.
3. The removal of projecting flues on the front elevation.
4. The removal of inappropriate horizontal-emphasis window on south elevation at second floor level and infilling with matching brickwork. Restoration of windows and matching brickwork where two doors exist on upper storey elevations. Removal of two external staircases and covered way at ground level.
5. More appropriate and sympathetic pitched roof in lieu of flat roof on single storey ground floor rear addition. And replacement of three newer windows to two timber sash windows to be more in keeping with the rest of the building.
6. General refurbishment of property both internally and externally.
7. Retention of a single planning unit that would allow the garden space to remain undivided. The scheme permitted in 2010 would result in the sub-division of the space to several separate gardens.

8. The provision of sympathetic subordinate additions to the original listed building that would enhance its setting. In particular timber vertical sliding sash windows would be utilised with gauged brick arches. External brickwork would match the listed building and matching plain clay tiles would be used to clad the roofs.
9. A first floor addition in contrasting cladding that would create a sympathetic way of linking the southern extension to the original building.
10. Boundary walls and railings would be retained, albeit the wall facing Homewell would be modified, to create a more harmonious setting for the original building and linked extension.
11. Retention of the original staircase to all floors, something that previously approved schemes did not allow for and exposure of the existing balustrading currently concealed by a stud partition.
12. Replacement skirting and architrave where already removed which will match original.
13. Removal of all flush doors and replaced with 4 panel ones.

Further to the list above we are now also proposing the following after receiving the current set of comments:

1. Increasing the size of the windows on the proposed extension.
2. Retaining of one door (within flat 10) and both frames and architraves on the ground floor layout.
3. Relocating of the second door on the ground floor within the new flat.
4. The unusual internal shutters to the two front facing ground floor windows to be repaired serviced and made functional.
5. Relocation of three four panel doors and architrave from the second floor.

During the pre-application process the scheme was re-designed several times following comments received, we have where feasible complied with every request. The sticking point seems to be the ground floor segregation; this unfortunately has been the only element we cannot compromise on and is a deal breaker for our client. As explained above it is reversible therefore is not contrary to good Conservation Practice and we have made improvements elsewhere to mitigate this. We hope that when deciding this application that a lot of consideration is given not only to the Boroughs need for such housing but also the local residents wishes, which we ourselves were surprised at how much this scheme was favoured over the original.

We are happy to submit revised drawings to reflect the five changes proposed above however we would request that you can confirm that these proposals are acceptable to yourselves before doing so.

We look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Heather McCrudden,
BA(hons) DIP MA Arch ARB

pdp architecture llp.

Encl.