



From: Martyn White <Martyn.White@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 July 2022 17:33
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: AB/62/22/L

AB/62/22/L

Mews house is a 2 storey, link detached building. It has a flat roof and is constructed from brick. The rear of the house is finished with a white paint, whilst the western elevation has a climbing plant on it. The property itself has been altered over time with various works taking place to it. These include replacement windows and what can be described as a first-floor decked area which is accessed by a spiral staircase. The southern and western elevations of the property are visible from an adjoining road which provides access for a number of surrounding properties.

To the front of Mews house is a stone-built boundary wall, which extends from neighbouring properties, and further along the road. The remaining boundary treatment for the property consists of close boarded fencing.

The property adjoins a larger terraced building, which is constructed from a similar brick on the front northern (front), and eastern elevations, whilst the remaining two elevations are painted. This neighbouring property has been identified as a listed building, with the following different assets being associated with it:

- Tower House and no 1 London road and railings to Tower House and No 1 London Road
- Wall of Tower House to north and east of garden and of No 14 Maltravers Street continuing to west of
- Raised pavement in front of Tower House including railings
- Brick gate piers to west of No 1 London Road

The application site therefore forms part of the settings of this asset. There are also a number of other assets in the local area including Arundel Priory, St Nicholas's Church and boundary walling and Arundel Cathedral.

Further, the property is located within the Arundel Conservation Area which contains a number of other heritage assets. This area of the town contains a combination of buildings, with the oldest dating back to the medieval period (which have been restored at various times), buildings from c1800, along with some small-scale infill housing development which was constructed in the late 20th century. Tower House/1 London Road form an attractive early C19, imposing property that plays a significant role in the street-scene with Mews house being historically ancillary, and visually subservient to it. The other listed structures associated with it are of a similar character and together form part of a strong developed group. The application property is viewed as part of this attractive group.

Whilst some form of heritage assessment is included within the application, it is very limited, and does not fully assess the significance of any assets affected by the proposal i.e. those referred to above. Such information should be provided in accordance with paragraph 194 of the NPPF (2021). Such information is required to assess the impact of the proposal upon the assets. In light of this I provided the following commentary

The Proposal

The proposal consists of two elements:

- Roof extension/mansard roof and rear Juliette balcony
- Rendering to walls of North and East elevation

These shall be discussed in turn below.

Roof extension/mansard roof and rear Juliette balcony

Whilst the description is to convert the (existing roof space) it would appear from the statements and plans that the actual proposal is to actually remove the existing roof and replace it with flat topped mansard roof. It is stated that this would begin 30cm inside the parapet wall and that the angle of the sloping part of the roof would be 70 degrees, and will rise 2.1 metres above the level of parapet wall. The would be a rear Juliette balcony with French window to the south (rear) and two dormers on the northern side.

It is noted that for both the neighbouring terrace, and this building, that the existing roofs are low and predominantly hidden behind a parapet so that they are not clearly seen from the road to the front. Such a feature is considered to be typical of a property of its period and style of architecture.

In introducing the additional floor and new roof space, the proposal would alter the scale and nature of the building so that it was no longer a visually subservient structure to Tower House. The new roof will be too high and dominant and would clearly be visible from the surrounding roads. It would be unsympathetic with the design of the host property (or neighbouring terrace), where the roof is not intended to be clearly seen.

The proposal is therefore out of character and would negatively impact upon the settings of the adjoining and nearby designated heritage assets and the character and appearance of the conservation area. This element is therefore considered to be harmful.

Rendering to walls of North (part) and East elevation

I note that the intention for the works on the northern elevation is to remove the door and ship-lap panelling on the single story extension (linking the house to Tower House), retain the window and render the wall. This seems appropriate and would be an enhancement in this particular area of the building. It is thought that the existing appearance of the shiplap is not appropriate or a style/material associated with this particular building, or its neighbour. This particular element is therefore acceptable.

Whilst the eastern elevation is identified by the applicant as being a way of enhancing the appearance of this particular elevation. As it is repeated on the neighbouring house, this elements seems to be acceptable.

I note from the Design and access Statement that the window/doors would be of a style to match the existing windows. The existing windows are UPVC, which is not really appropriate for a positive building in a conservation area, especially one such as Arundel. Ideally, new joinery should be more appropriate in terms of material. As indicated in my comments on the previous application, the replacement of the current windows on the street elevation with painted timber vertically sliding sash windows would greatly improve the appearance of the building.

Conclusion

Overall, whilst the smaller elements have been identified as acceptable, the larger scale element of the proposal is harmful. This is identified as causing less than substantial harm in accordance with paragraph 202 of the NPPF (2021). 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

Please note: I work on Conservation for half of the working week – all day Monday and Friday and Tuesday afternoons only.

T: 01903 737717

E: Martyn.white@arun.gov.uk

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

