




From: Martyn White
Sent: 14 December 2018 12:05
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: BR/214/18/PL

BR/214/18/PL

The application is for a terrace of four houses which would front on to West Street. The site is part of the former tennis court to the Royal Norfolk (a listed building) and is located within the Waterloo Square and the Steyne conservation area. Further, there are a number of listed and locally listed buildings in the local area. Development in this location therefore has the potential to affect the setting of a listed building, but also the character of the conservation area.

The Royal Norfolk Hotel is a landmark building within the conservation area and occupies a prominent position along the sea-front. The hotel is a large three storey building set in spacious grounds and extends diagonally across its plot from West Street towards Aldwick Road. The building dates from about 1840 and has been extended twice, with the most recent works taking place in the early 1970's.

The hotel has an open setting, which consists mostly of extensive lawns to the front of the building (and an enclosed area to the eastern side), which contribute to its prominence within the local area. As acknowledged, the spacious surroundings allow the side elevation of the hotel to be viewed, along with the principal elevation. This contrasts with the denser development within other parts of the conservation area.

The grounds of the hotel have already been subject to new residential development. In 2007, the derelict stable and coach houses to the north of the hotel were converted, extended, and partially rebuilt to provide new residential units accessed via a private road from West Street. Such development is of a scale as not to be overly visible from the street.

The application site is roughly square in shape and located to the eastern side of the hotel building. At the present time it is a vacant plot of land enclosed by a close-boarded fence and hedge. Whilst the site appears to be in an unkempt state, the existing screening means that it still contributes to the open character of this part of West Street. It is therefore still an important feature of the plot and local area. The fact that the site is in separate ownership does not affect this element at all.

Likewise, although the appeal site is separated from the hotel frontage by hedging, it contributes to the setting of the listed building. The development to the north of the hotel is generally smaller in scale, and it is separated from the curtilage of the hotel. Whilst it provides a backdrop to views of the hotel from the south, it generally remains subservient to it.

Further, the terraced dwellings within the conservation area vary in terms of age, design, and height. The relationship between the open spaces within the conservation area and the surrounding built development is intrinsic to its character. In the Steyne, the dwellings are arranged around a rectangular open space at right angles to the sea, whilst Waterloo Square is arranged around a landscaped space fronting onto the sea front.

The proposed terrace would continue development further towards the seafront in a location which does not appear to have had development before. Further, it would erode the space around the listed building, and harm the established character of the area.

The terrace of houses would be located in close proximity to the listed building and even with the hedge screening on the southern boundary would be read in the context of the listed building.

I also note from looking at the drawing which identifies the view of the front elevation from West Street, that the roof of the central two buildings would not be seen. This is in contrast to the second elevation 'view from south' which indicates that the second blue sight line would see the roof. Which is correct?

The design of the terrace is such that the middle two units would include a roof terrace. Such a feature would introduce an additional area of amenity space for use by the residents. It is considered that such a feature is not prominent in the local area, and would be in contrast to the established character. It is considered that the roof terraces would introduce further clutter in the form of garden furniture etc. which would be visually distracting, and inappropriate.

As a consequence, it is considered that the development of the land, which would lead to the loss of the open space to the east of the hotel, and would harm the character of the conservation area, and cannot be supported.