

LISTED BUILDING CONSENT REPORT**REF NO:** AB/100/11/L**LOCATION:** Newburgh House
School Lane
Arundel**PROPOSAL:** Application for Listed Building Consent to create new opening in wall between kitchen & living room**SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The proposal would form an opening which is 3.6m in width at which point there would be a difference in floor level between the rooms of 230mm.
SITE AREA	Approximately 54 square metres.
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DEN	N/A
TOPOGRAPHY	School Lane is on a lower level than Maltravers Street.
TREES	None affected by the proposed development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Front boundary directly onto highway, rear boundary has wall + hedging approximately 3m in height, west side boundary has close boarded fencing approximately 1.8m in height, east side boundary has wall + close boarded fencing approximately 1.8m in height.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Grade II Listed Building. Former coach house which is single storey and has been divided into three garages, one for Newburgh House, Herricks House and Belford House. Garage building has mixed brickwork, wood detail above wooden garage doors with a red clay tiled roof. Newburgh House which is three storeys has smooth painted rendered walls, timber windows with a red tiled roof.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Within the Arundel Conservation Area. Residential with a mixture of two and three storey terraced properties, library and clinic to west of site.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

AB/60/08/L	Application for Listed Building Consent for conversion of roof space over existing garages to form additional accommodation	Approve Cond 17-06-2008
AB/139/83/L	Listed Building Consent for demolition of single storey building	Refused 23-11-1983

AB/119/84/L	C.O.U from public house and maisonette to form 2 houses and 3 flats extend existing garage to form 2 garages	Refused 14-11-1984
AB/120/84/L	L.B.C for C.O.U to form 2 hses garages 3 flats replace garage door with 2 new doors demolish existing toilets amend windows	Refused 14-11-1984
AB/159/84/L	C.O.U to 2 hses 1 mais 1 flat alts to garage & provide 3 demolish toilets build kit/ext rear & 6 windows front door	Approve Cond 20-03-1985
AB/158/84/L	L.B.C. for C.O.U to 2 houses 1 mais & flat with alts to exist garage demolish toilets 6 new windows amend door 3 garages	Approve Cond 11-04-1985

REPRESENTATIONS

Representations received:

Arundel Town Council

No objection.

The Georgian Group:

Object to what appears to be the original rear elevation wall, the applicants have provided no information to the contrary of this.

Comments on Representations received:

Comments above are noted. It is confirmed that the wall subject of the works was originally the rear wall of the building.

CONSULTATIONS

Conservation Area Advisory Com
The Ancient Monuments Society
Council for British Archeology
The Georgian Group
Soc. Protect. Ancient Buldgs
The Victorian Society
English Heritage
The Arundel Society
Listed Building Officer
Listed Building Officer

Consultations responses received:

Listed Buildings Advisor:

Objection; Whilst new internal openings in listed buildings can be acceptable, under PPS5 (2010), harm to a heritage asset may not be appropriate where excessive levels of historic fabric are being removed and where justification for that loss is not convincing.

This scheme is made more difficult by the proposal to remove a large section of former external wall. Whilst it is now viewed internally, a principal wall is always going to be integral to the original structure and an understanding of the buildings earlier form and character.

There are two areas of guidance from English Heritage which are particularly relevant here:

Para.179. The fabric will always be an important part of the assets significance. Retention of as much historic fabric as possible is therefore a fundamental part of any good alteration or conversion.

Para.182. The plan form of a building is frequently one of its most important characteristics and internal partitions, staircases and other features are likely to form part of its significance. Indeed they may be its most significant feature. Proposals to remove or modify internal arrangements, including the insertion of new openings or extension underground, will be subject to the same considerations of impact on significance (particularly architectural interest) as for externally visible alterations.

In this instance, a large amount of historic wall is being lost and the living room opened up into the kitchen. This is not sympathetic to the nature of an historic building, particularly a domestic one, or the function of these rooms; nor is it justified. Where harm is being caused in these instances, the main consideration must be justification. Policy HE9.1 of PPS 5 stipulates that:

There should be a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Loss affecting any designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.

On this basis and for the reasons above the scheme cannot be supported.

Conservation Area Advisory Committee:
Internal only.

Comments on Consultation responses:

Comments are noted.

POLICY CONTEXT

Designation Applicable to Site:
Within the Built Up Area Boundary
Within the Arundel Conservation Area
Grade II Listed Building

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

South East Plan:	SEPBE6	Management of the Historic Environment
Arun District Local Plan:	GEN2	Built-up Area Boundary
	GEN7	The Form of New Development
	AREA2	Conservation Areas

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

PPS1	Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS5	Planning for the Historic Environment

SUPPLEMENTARY POLICY GUIDANCE

ADS	The Arundel Design Statement by Arundel Town Council
-----	--

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies combine to describe the criteria against which the application will be assessed particularly with specific regard to impact upon the Listed Building and character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 16(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states:

"In considering whether to grant Listed Building Consent for any works, the Local Planning Authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

Where the building is located in a Conservation Area, Section 71(1) of the Act states:

In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a Conservation Area of any powers (under the Planning Acts), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

The proposal is considered to conflict with these criteria in that it would materially affect the character and historic layout of the Grade II Listed Building.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is considered that there are no other material considerations to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan and/or legislative background.

CONCLUSIONS

Newburgh House is a Grade II Listed Building with the former coach house which is attached being sub-divided into three garages with accommodation above. The proposal seeks permission to create a new opening between the existing kitchen and living room.

The proposed works would be to the original rear wall of building which now adjoins a rear extension to accommodate the kitchen. Internally, traditional cornicing is not noted. However in this case a significant amount of the historic wall would be lost which in this case is not at all sympathetic to the historic building, nor the function of the kitchen and living room.

In addition no justification is made for the works and it would appear that the proposed works would only accommodate a rather more modern layout to the building which is inappropriate in this case.

It is therefore recommended that that application be refused for the following reason.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

- 1 The removal of a large section of the original rear elevation wall would exceed that which would be acceptable as a means of conserving the listed building and results in the loss of a significant part of an historic asset, detracting from the special character and historic layout of the listed building. The proposal would thereby conflict with Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5) 'Planning and the Historic Environment' and Policy BE6 of the South East Plan.