


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



Our priorities...

 Improving the wellbeing of Arun	 Delivering the right homes in the right places	 Supporting our environment to support us	 Fulfilling Arun's economic potential	 
---	--	--	---	--

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)

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

From: Daniel Vick <Daniel.Vick@arun.gov.uk>

Sent: 01 September 2022 08:42

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED] Louise Shaw <Louise.Shaw@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: Urgent!FW: AL/72/22/PL

Mr Hadnett,

Thanks for your email.

As the application has been submitted by your agent we are obliged to act on instructions from them. We currently have a request to withdraw the application from your agent. As the application should be determined today if we do not get an amended instruction from your agent by 11:00 we will withdraw the application as has been agreed. If we do get an amended instruction from your agent to not withdraw by 11 we will refuse the application.

You will then have the opportunity to appeal the decision, reapply to address our concerns or do both.

Daniel Vick

Team Leader (Development Management), Planning

T: 01903 737771

E: daniel.vick@arun.gov.uk

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

www.arun.gov.uk





From: Steven Hadnett [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 August 2022 20:31
To: Louise Shaw <Louise.Shaw@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Clare Blatchford-Hanna [REDACTED] Martin Downes [REDACTED]
Subject: Urgent!FW: AL/72/22/PL

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.

Dear Louise

I understand there have been discussions about withdrawing the application; as the applicant I do not wish to withdraw. I agree to a month deferral to 30th September. If you feel this is unreasonable, and are unable to approve the current application, then please issue a refusal, which I will then appeal.

This is after all, a modest application which is not in a conservation area, it is not a listed building and in accordance neighbourhood plan, we are incorporating flint walling.

You will of course already be aware, that the only objection to our plans is from the conservation officer and not from any of the residents or parish council.

Yours sincerely

Steve Hadnett
Rock House
Westergate Street
Westergate
PO20 3RJ

From: Martin Downes [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 August 2022 09:22
To: Steven Hadnett [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: AL/72/22/PL

Hi Steve, here is the report as requested.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Louise Shaw <Louise.Shaw@arun.gov.uk>
Date: 30 August 2022 at 17:14:58 BST
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: AL/72/22/PL

Dear Mr Downs

Please find a copy of the Conservation Officers Consultation Response below.

Yours sincerely

Louise Shaw

Planning Officer



T: 01903737576

E: Louise.Shaw@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](#)

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area, please go to

<https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>

Sent: 26 August 2022 19:40
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Louise Shaw <Louise.Shaw@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: AL/72/22/PL

AL/72/22/PL

Rock House Westergate Street Westergate PO20 3RJ

Demolition of Servac Int workshops keeping certain structures and features, to renovate them in to a 2 No carport, with storage loft and re-landscaping to provide new gardens and biodiversity zones.

Whilst a heritage statement has been prepared it does not identify the significance of the heritage assets affected by the proposal in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF. In light of this I provide the following comments:

The site is located next to Hop Garden Cottage. Hop Garden Cottage is a Grade II Listed Building. It is an C18 Cottage which has been extended to both the west and east in the C20. It is of flint construction with red brick dressings, hipped thatched roof with end brick stacks. There is a central C19 porch with hipped tile roof. There is a single storey gabled addition to west, also in flint with red brick dressings and thatched roof with semi-circular window above and 5-bay oriel below.

According to the listing description the interior features include an open fireplace, exposed beams and plank doors. It is of architectural and historical significance.

The cottage is mostly experienced from within its curtilage and to a certain extent from outside of this from the road. Rock House as the neighbouring building is not physically connected, but the two can be viewed from the road to the front.

Rock House is an attractive building with painted flint elevations and a mixture of sliding sash and casement windows. It also has two single storey elements, one of which looks as if it could have been part of a larger, single storey barn structure (based on a review of historic mapping). Sadly, the building has been poorly altered and extended over time. However, despite the alterations it retains a characterful building with an import street elevation.

It appears on the 1875-90 OS map and has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset.

The Proposal

The proposal is for the demolition of the majority of the existing Servac Int workshops and features, to renovate them into a carport for two vehicles, with storage loft above and re-landscaping to provide new gardens (including new boundary treatment to the west of the site).

The existing building has been developed and altered over time so that the positive elements of the building are negatively impacted upon by the large, poorly designed workshops. The proposal to remove part of these inappropriate structures and replace them with something else is positive. Such an approach should help the existing, older part of the building, to be better revealed and experienced.

The proposed car port is of a simple design, with gables to match the house. It also appears to have a limited pallet of materials, which seems to be acceptable. This element of the proposal is closest to the listed building, but it is located in the same place as an existing structure, as opposed to being constructed in an entirely new, undeveloped part of the site. Although, it should be noted that the existing structure is not as high as the proposed car port.

Whilst the design does have some positive elements, the use of the roof space as storage will mean that the building will be higher than it could be if this space was not included. The storage space will cover a large floor space area and could be put into an alternative use in the future. This increase in height will mean that it will be seen not only in the context of Rock House (so that it is not really subservient to it), but also the side elevation of the listed building. Its sheer height will mean that the

eye will be drawn to it when viewing the two buildings from the surrounding roads. This element is therefore problematical, and not acceptable.

New boundary walling is planned to enclose the front garden space as well as create a courtyard space for bin storage etc. and enclose the carports. The new walling will be clearly visible from the road to the front of the house, and in the context of the heritage building. This will need to be carefully considered and constructed so as to not detract from the existing building and walling etc. It is recommended that details and a sample panel provided, as we would not wish to see the modern 'standard' flint block used in a location such as this. It is also not clear if the new enclosed front garden area would be enclosed by a gate, alongside the new walling. Please can this be confirmed?

The southern elevations do not show how the existing 'garage doors' on the proposed workshop will be treated – at present the only bit of the site that this elevation shows is the proposed glasshouse. I note that the proposed ground floor plan indicated that it will be a window of some sort, but it is not clear how they will look. Please can this be confirmed, and additional information provided?

Further to the above, there are other inconsistencies between the floor plans and the elevations: on the proposed ground floor plans, the boot room/utility is to have a window on the west elevation, whereas the proposed west elevation shows the same opening to be a doorway? The proposed ground floor plans for shows that the opening on the western elevation for the office (formerly office 3) will not contain a window, whereas the elevation shows that it is to remain as it is! (i.e. with a window). It is also not clear if the louvered window on the western elevation of the proposed workshop will remain as it is as indicated on the proposed elevation or replaced with a window as indicated on the proposed floor plan? Please can these be dealt with so that we can understand exactly what is proposed and where!

Reference is made on the application to replacement windows, but it is not clear if this is referring to any new windows/doors, or if all of the existing windows will be replaced. Details of all replacement windows and doors should be provided if you recommend approving the application. They should be of an appropriate design and material for this building.

Point to note: The plans titles 'west elevation – roadside' appears to show that the proposed gate will cover the majority of the frontage of the car port with a small stretch of wall to the left hand side, whereas the ground floor plan implies that the same opening will cover the width of what is identified as 'car port 1', with a much larger stretch of wall. Which is correct?

Suggested Conditions

If this application is recommended for approval, the following conditions are recommended:

1. Details of all materials
2. Details of the brick bond to be used
3. Details of all joinery, including sections and set back from the front elevation (i.e. the reveal)
4. Details of landscaping to the front garden
5. Details of colours to be used on the external elevations and external joinery of the building.
6. Details of the materials of the boundary walling
7. A sample panel of the proposed sections of walling

Conclusion

On balance, whilst the concept of redeveloping the site and removing the later additions is acceptable, the design of the garage is not suitable. The proposal is therefore such that the impact can be described as causing less than substantial harm in accordance with paragraph 202 and 203 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



<http://www.arun.gov.uk>

DX 57406 Littlehampton

You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from <https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.
