

From: Zac Denton <Zac.Denton@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 January 2021 09:39
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: AB/109/20/HH

Consultation response

Zachariah Denton
Planning Officer

T: 01903 737500 (37337)
E: zac.denton@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



From: Martyn White <Martyn.White@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 23 December 2020 14:49
To: Zac Denton <Zac.Denton@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: AB/109/20/HH

AB/109/20/HH

White Cottage 32 King Street Arundel BN18 9BW

Rear single storey extension for new kitchen and living area, internal alterations, new and adjusted windows and doors, part replacement roof structure with 2 x conservation roof lights to

the main building, re-covering of main roof and partial re-build of the detached garage with replacement pitched roof.

White Cottage is located within the Arundel Conservation Area. One of the principal attractions of Arundel is its wealth of buildings representing architectural form and style through progressive periods, which form a cohesive and contained hillside town. There are a number of listed buildings in the local area, including 24-30 (even numbers) and 36 King Street. King Street consists predominantly of a series of terraced houses which were developed from the early C19. Predominant materials include flint and brick, render and slate roofing with some clay tiles also present. Properties front directly onto the pavement and a number are small in scale.

The property itself is an attractive element of the street being a mixture of painted brick and tile hanging walls. It has casement windows and fronts directly onto the road. It is of aesthetic significance.

The Proposal

The proposed works are extensive and include a rear single storey extension, internal alterations, new and adjusted windows and doors, part replacement roof structure with 2 conservation roof lights to the main building, re-covering of main roof and partial re-build of the detached garage with replacement pitched roof.

The proposed extension is substantial and will occupy a large floor area, representing a substantial part of the existing ground floor. Further, the design/size of the extension would mean that it would dominate the rear elevation of the property and be out of character. Whilst I note references to the fact that the extension would attempt to replicate the shape of a previous extension, it is not fully clear why the extension has been designed as it has been. Whilst I have previously identified that the loss of the former extension was harmful ('less than substantial harm'), it is not clear how some attempt to replicate the shape of the former structure is necessarily a satisfactory approach. This is especially when the positive features of that construction do not appear to be present in this proposal. It is suggested that an alternative design could be prepared that would have a more positive impact.

I am also concerned to see the removal of the clay tile hanging tiles from the front and rear elevations and their replacement with a painted render finish (as seen on the elevation plans). Historically, tile hanging is particularly associated with Kent, Surrey and Sussex. The style was used more widely in the late 19th and early 20th century under the influence of the Arts & Crafts movement. Its inclusion on this particular property forms part of the established appearance and therefore character of the building. Its loss would detract from the building, especially the front and street elevation.

The replacement windows would also be of a different appearance; at present they are leaded timber or metal windows. The use of UPVC in a conservation area and a positive building is unfortunate, especially in a road where so many of the surrounding buildings are listed (i.e. designated heritage assets).

The works to the roof which will see the replacement of the existing tiles with something more appropriate for a conservation area is a positive feature of the application, and one capable of support.

Conclusion

At present, whilst there is potential to extend and alter the building, it is considered that the current proposal is harmful, and cannot be supported. The proposal is such that the impact can be

described as causing less than substantial harm in accordance with paragraph 196 of the NPPF (2019). As such, you will also need to consider the public benefits that the development may achieve as part of your assessment of the application, along with the contents of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

Martyn White

Principal Conservation Officer,
Planning Services



Please note: I work on Conservation for half of the working Week (all day Monday and Friday and Tuesday Afternoons)

T: 01903 737717

E: Martyn.White@arun.gov.uk or Conservation.officer@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF

www.arun.gov.uk

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)

