

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

Application Number	AB/105/13/L & AB/104/13/
Address	Bevin Bevin & Co Ltd River Road, Arundel, BN18 9DH
Description	Application for Listed Building Consent for redevelopment and conversion of the former Bevin Bevin site to provide 7No. apartments and 6No. houses with associated car parking
Case Officer	Peter Cleveland
Site Visit	6 November 2013

Objection

Whilst the principle of conversion has been largely agreed and is not in question here, there remain significant concerns with aspects of the proposal which are considered harmful to the listed building, related structures and consequently its setting. A particular concern are with those which relate to buildings of 'high significance' within the Heritage Statement, but also the incremental harm of numerous changes that occur throughout the scheme.

They are issues which should be able to be overcome through design amendments such as a more creative use of the interior spaces. At present the proposals here read as rather orthodox interiors, when they should really respond to the existing spatial qualities and expression of an industrial aesthetic. In this respect there should also be some reference to the retention of features and internal treatments such as stone floors and structure.

In the main listed building, building 1, issues arise with the introduction of a turning stair and the loss of the more simple and appropriate straight stair, as well as the associated enclosures. The level of subdivision, particularly on the second floor is also an issue and should be reduced. There was discussion on site about the possibility of putting the bedroom up on a mezzanine to allow the main floor space to be better expressed. This should be considered. On the ground floor there appears to be a significant loss of timber structure and features which might be better utilized. In the proposed scheme, the wall between the Common Hall and the dining area on the ground floor is overly utilitarian in its form. Further details are also required regarding retention of features such as flooring, trap doors, structure wall surfaces etc and how these maintain the character and sense of this space as an industrial building.

Building 2 appears to result in total loss of the floor plan which is not appropriate given the potential value of plans to significance. The proposed plan with a centralized bathroom and WC dividing the space is similarly

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.

problematic. The turning stair is also not particularly appropriate in this instance and should ideally be straight. This plan should be reconsidered.

Building 3 appears to have originally been open in plan which is at odds with the proposed scheme. The level and nature of the subdivision is considered excessive and does not allow for any appreciation of the space. The first floor is particularly problematic in this regard, again the use of angled walls is not sympathetic with the character of the building.

Building 4 consists of three ranges and is identified in the Heritage Statement as the former 'Tun Room' and an important part of the brewing process. As such it is considered to be a structure of 'high significance' as well as an important architectural feature of the site. Given this special interest, the loss of one of the three ranges is not considered acceptable. As well as removal of large amounts of historic fabric, this results in denser internal spaces, again strongly sub-divided, both horizontally and vertically. The large roof lights and banks of windows on the south elevation also seem excessive for bedrooms of this scale.

Building 5 is identified for removal. This does not appear to be a strong issue given the apparent date of the building and the former use of this space as an open courtyard.

Building 6 is identified for removal, which given its late age is unlikely to be problematic.

Building 7 is only partially retained, with the roof being removed and the walls left to form a courtyard. This will have consequences for the roof scape of the site and may result in a rather odd courtyard feature in an industrial site. This is not as yet convincing.

Building 8 is only partially retained, with a section of roof being removed to form a courtyard garden. This loss would be visible from River Road to the south though is likely to have less impact than that for building 7. That said, it remains a concern.

Building 9 is a later building, though largely intact. The alterations here are largely acceptable, though there should be less subdivision, especially on the ground floor.

Building 10 is of little consequence with the exception of the wall to the west. On the basis that this is retained, there is no objection to the removal of the roof and east wall which is concrete block.

Building 11 is considered to be of low significance, though the main walls are of consequence to this part of the site and the broader street scene. They also appear to have some archaeological value in terms of the fabric and stone types. The proposed dwellings here have sought to maintain an industrial aesthetic with sliding wooden doors etc. Whilst this might work, it may also be achieved purely through the design and proportion of the fenestration allowing

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 buildings to appear more understated and less cluttered. At present the proposed scale of the buildings also still appears rather large for their context. I would be interested to see a perspective from the site back towards River Road so their full impact can be properly assessed.

Building 12 is considered to be of low importance and is in quite poor condition. Whilst its removal is not an issue, the proposed building is likely to block views back up into the town. This should be minimized if at all possible.

More generally there should be careful consideration of the new windows and doors which should appear specific to the scheme. Roof light design is an important consideration given the number of them and it may be the case that a metal split-pane type, might be more appropriate than a standard conservation window. In some instances new casements might also appear better as multi-paned and perhaps painted metal rather than timber. These could have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the brewery site and should be included early as part of a bespoke approach, both towards each building and the site as a whole.

Ian Wightman
Historic Buildings Adviser