Oliver Hoban

From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments:	Sarah Papaleo 29 April 2024 09:56 Development Control FW: Consultation response: 4/24/2090/0F1 - 49 KING STREET, WHITEHAVEN 20230722_170649.jpg; 20230722_170702.jpg; 20230722_170708.jpg; 20230722_ 170720.jpg; 20230722_170725.jpg; 20230722_170734.jpg; 20230722_170744.jpg; 20230722_170750.jpg; 20230722_170754.jpg; 20230722_170803.jpg; 20230722_ 170808.jpg; 20230722_170831.jpg; 20230722_170834.jpg; 20230722_170835.jpg; 20230722_170919.jpq; 20230722_170923.jpg; 20230722_170929.jpq; 20230722_
Importance:	20230722_170919.jpg; 20230722_170923.jpg; 20230722_170929.jpg; 20230722_ 170932.jpg; 20230722_170942.jpg; 20230722_170946.jpg; 20230722_170954.jpg; 20230722_171002.jpg; 20230722_171010.jpg; 20230722_171741.jpg; KS2023- A01050-Existing and Proposed Rear Elevation-P3.pdf High

Hi,

Can I have these on MIS and the website and a full re-consultation for 21 days? Many thanks 😊

Please note that the advice in this email is given in good faith on the basis of the information available at the present time. The advice may be subject to revision following further examination or consultation, or where additional information comes to light, and is therefore not binding on any future recommendation which may be made to the Council or any formal decision by the Council.

Kind regards,

Sarah Papaleo MRTPI

Senior Planning Officer Development Management Cumberland Council

From: Sukhjeet Dhillon Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2024 8:00 AM To: Sarah Papaleo Subject: Re: Consultation response: 4/24/2090/0F1 - 49 KING STREET, WHITEHAVEN Importance: High

CAUTION: External email, think before you click! Please report any suspicious email to our <u>IT Helpdesk</u>

Hi Sarah,

Hope you are well.

I note there were no objections from Whitehaven Town Council and that Environmental Health have asked for conditions to be added.

Just to give you an update on the other responses, the client will be providing an updated flood risk assessment/report to replace the one that was submitted to the environment agency.

In relation to the conservation officers comments I have provided my responses below and attached the relevant information that was requested.

- The heritage statement says the upper two floors of the building will be converted to holiday lets, however, the plans show the upper three floors of a four-storey building converted to holiday lets, so it would be helpful if this is clarified. To confirm all 3 floors will be holiday lets.
- There should be more clarity on proposed windows, and replacement should follow the advice set out in our Conservation Area Design Guide SPD where possible (e.g. making use of timber sliding-sash windows unless otherwise justified). These details could be included within the application docs, or supplied via a condition to be discharged prior to the replacement of the windows at a future date. We would like to supply these details as a condition prior to the replacement of the windows please.
- I'm unclear about the location of new extractor vents and soil vent pipes, so if the locations of these could be highlighted, that would be of assistance.

The bathrooms have been positioned to the rear elevation and will connect into the existing external soil pipes. Extractor vents will be to the rear elevation too and will be located close to the opening windows.

- What rain water goods are currently in situ? In accordance with the Conservation Area Design Guide, rain water goods should be retained in cast iron and replacements carried out to match. We can confirm that these are cast iron and any replacements will be provided to match.
- •
- Modifications to the shop front should be carried out in accordance with our Shopfront Design Guide SPD

We note the modifications to the existing ground floor commercial unit and shopfront have already been approved under the application (4/23/2258/0F1).

- •
- The proportions and detailing of the new rear dormer still appear rather simplistic and unrefined. The design could benefit from further work in this area.

Please see attached further details in relation to the proposed dormer. A traditional dormer is being proposed. Can further details for this be conditioned?

• Although not a listed building, impact on non-designated heritage assets still needs to be taken into consideration in the determination of planning applications. It would therefore be very helpful to have supplied a collection of photos showing the interiors.

The client has provided a collection of photos of the interior, which are attached. As can be seen the existing building is in need of repair.

Regards,

Sukhjeet Singh

Principal Architect (B.Arch, M.Arch, PG.Dip, ARB, RIBA)

