

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

Application Number	AB/121/12/L
Address	Land adjacent to 84 Maltravers Street, Arundel
Description	Erection of 1 new dwelling.
Case Officer	Anita Gardner
Site Visit	29 February 2012 & 21 November 2012

Objection

This scheme is very similar to the previous application AB/8/12. The main body of comments made then remains largely pertinent to this case. They were as follows:

'84 Maltravers Street is an end of terrace house which appears to date from the early 19th century. The terrace has a strong cohesion in terms of its form and design and an over all symmetry that renders it complete with respect to the building's scope and appearance. The fenestration and doors in particular inform this symmetry and balance which to date remain uncompromised.

As such, the terrace constitutes a significant feature of the conservation area as entered from the main highway. Its white stucco finish and proximity to the road gives it a prominence in the streetscape that contrasts strongly with the stone and brick buildings beyond. Its polite nature is also a distinctive feature within the conservation area here and contributes to Arundel's varied architectural and historic character. Viewed from the south, the terrace is terminated with a twin gable which gives some understanding of the building in the round. Beyond this, historic buildings can be seen on Park Place and Mount Pleasant within the conservation area.

Unfortunately, the proposal to add a further dwelling to the terrace can only compromise its historic form and design and as such its broader contribution to the conservation area as described. It would certainly harm the symmetry of the group as well as undermine its integrity as an historic feature of the town.'

The previous comments also went on to discuss the setback position of the proposed building and the boundary treatment which were seen to compound the above issues. In this scheme they have been changed and the elevation made flush with the listed building, as if this somehow alleviates the problem. Unfortunately, this misunderstands the fundamental concern that any addition to this terrace, however well replicated would be harmful to the historic group

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.

and would undermine its integrity. In this instance the most faithful replication of the façade and frontage would be greatly misleading if not pastiche.

Even if it was an appropriate conservation approach, replication is not achievable here as any new dwelling will require double-glazing to meet SAP calculations. This would alter the window profile and appearance which in turn would be harmful to the broader group. In this instance it would also include a new range of windows on the south west elevation which are not a feature of the current listed building. These would affect the character of the terrace as well as its setting. The windows would be a distraction to the historic façade and at night would offer light spill.

As mentioned previously, setting is fundamental to the group's appreciation within the conservation area. Of particular concern here is the space around the building, its strong relationship to the street scene, as well as the relative permeability of the site which contributes to the appreciation of the broader context and townscape beyond.

In considering its impact, both on the listed building, its setting and that of the conservation area, this scheme certainly does not preserve or enhance the heritage assets as required under the NPPF. Rather it results in harm which would require broader social benefits to outweigh it. Para 132 of the NPPF states:

'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. ...'

Whilst this would be considered 'less than substantial harm' (ie not involving large scale loss or demolition) in historic environment terms, the design ultimately results in unnecessary harm to all designated heritage assets which under the terms of the NPPF cannot be considered as 'sustainable'. One of the core principles of the NPPF is to conserve heritage assets as part of a holistic approach towards sustainability. This includes design that conserves or enhances the historic environment.

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

Ian Wightman
Historic Buildings Adviser