

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 6LF  
[www.arun.gov.uk](http://www.arun.gov.uk)

**To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to**  
<https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>



**From:** Brian Banister [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 19 February 2025 09:50  
**To:** Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Arun Conservation Area Advisory Panel comments on applications

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Hello,

The **Arun Conservation Area Advisory Panel** wish to make the following comments on the applications:

**AB/3/25/HH - 33 Maltravers Street, Arundel**

**No Objection**

The Panel considered the proposal to be well designed and that it would make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

**AB/6/25/PL and AB/7/25/L - Sparks Yard, 18 Tarrant Street, Arundel**

**No Objection**

It is considered that the proposed works will not harm the character or appearance of the conservation area.

**AB/10/25/L - 17A High Street, Arundel**

**No Objection**

It is considered that the proposals will have no impact on the character or appearance of the conservation area.

## **AB/11/25/HH - 1B Brewery Hill, Arundel**

### **No Objection**

It is considered that the proposed works will not harm the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Note: Ms Jennifer Wright declared a non-pecuniary interest in the application and took no part in the Panel's consideration of it.

## **AB/21/25/PL - Crown Yard Car Park, Arundel**

### **Objection**

Crown Yard Car Park, located in the core of the conservation area, is a public space well used by residents, visitors and tourists. There are important views out to the wider townscape and to the nearby surrounding historic buildings and structures.

The Panel understand the current need for the storage unit but consider that, given the heritage asset context, it would not be appropriate to grant a permanent planning permission for the container which is of an industrial and temporary appearance, out of keeping with the character of the locality. A permanent long term solution needs to be found which would provide a structure of sympathetic design and materials either in this location or elsewhere in the town centre. The Panel suggest that a two year temporary planning permission would be appropriate for the current proposal.

In the meantime, the Panel considered that the blue painted front elevation of the container only exacerbated its inappropriate appearance and that it would be better to repaint it in the same grey as its side elevations.

Note: Cllr Carolyn Kenney declared an interest in the application as an Arundel Town Councillor and took no part in the Panel's consideration of it.

## **AB/26/25/L - Houghton House, 4 Arun Street, Arundel**

### **No Objection**

It is considered that the proposals will have no adverse impact on the character or appearance of the conservation area.

It is suggested that more precise details of the new double doors and of the new rooflight (conservation style preferred) should be required.

Note: Cllr Carolyn Kenney and Ms Leeza Aldis-Hobbs declared interests as applicant and agent respectively and left the room during the Panel's consideration of the application and took no part in it.

## **AW/35/25/HH - 226 Manor Way, Aldwick**

### **Objection**

The existing front elevation is of a symmetrical design and the building makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The Panel consider that the attractive profile of the property would be compromised because the front wall of the new garage is proposed to be in the same plane as the existing front main wall. The new structure needs to read as a subservient feature and its front wall should be set back from the front elevation of the host building and also constructed in matching materials.

## **BE/10/25/S73 - Walnut Tree Cottage, Shripney Lane, Bersted**

### **Objection**

Shripney Lane has an attractive, distinctly rural character with historic buildings and other buildings and structures of traditional design and materials located along it in an informal manner. The proposed new building will form part of that heritage asset context and it is essential that its quality of materials and finishes should be of a very high standard.

It is accepted generally that the use of pvcu windows in historic contexts is rarely acceptable because of inappropriate proportions, surface finish etc. and that traditional materials, finishes and

detailing should be pursued. As such, in this instance, traditional painted timber windows or, second best, powder coated aluminium (finer proportions than pvcu can usually be achieved) need to be insisted upon.

#### **FG/12/25/HH - Evergreen Cottage, 1 Ferring Street, Ferring**

##### **Objection**

The Panel do not object to the principle of the proposed development but object to the seeming lack of information concerning the appearance of the new structure which should surely form part of the application.

#### **FP/169/24/PL - The Old Rectory, Vicarage Lane, Felpham**

##### **Objection**

This imposing building of a pleasing vernacular design and appearance is an important feature in the Vicarage Lane street scene and as viewed from Old Rectory Gardens. Its interesting array of traditional roof forms and prominent chimney stacks contribute materially to its attractive appearance. As such the building makes a distinctly positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area and this is recognised in the Council's recent Conservation Area Character Appraisal.

In the opinion of the Panel, the proposals include overlarge, overbulky and inappropriate extensions (which include a flat roofed first floor structure) which will materially detract from the appearance of the existing building and the conservation area. The loss of the prominent and imposing chimney stack is also inappropriate.

It is considered that the building requires a much more sensitive and less intrusive approach in the design of any alterations and additions. Paragraph 219 of the NPPF 2024 refers to the need for development to better reveal the heritage significance of a conservation area and that, surely, includes the buildings and structures within it.

#### **R/10/25/L - Pound Cottage, 28 The Street, Rustington**

##### **No Objection**

It is considered that the proposals will have no impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The Panel commended the amount of detail shown in the application and is of the level which should be required by the Local Authority for any proposals for window replacement in heritage assets.

Kind regards

Brian Banister MRTPI(Rtd), GradDiplConsAA.

On behalf of ACAAP