

Zac Denton
Planning Dept
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Rd
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF

Sea Barn
Brookside Rd
Kingston Gorse
East Preston
West Sussex
BN16 1SE

8th May 2019

Dear Mr Denton

Planning Application: REF K/9/19/HH
Kingston Corner, Brookside Rd, Kingston Gorse, BN16 1SE

Please consider the comments here-in as support for my OBJECTION to the application above. I write as the owner and occupier of Sea Barn, the neighbouring property situated directly to the south of Kingston Corner.

The planning application for the above proposed development refers to “the replacement of an existing studio building, adjacent to the house, with a new studio building, to be used as an extension to the house”. The studio referred to is a single-storey garden shed, located more than 10m from the main house and has never been used as an annexe or for the purposes of accommodation. The proposed two-storey development will be a substantial building in its own right, providing a self-contained dwelling separate from the existing accommodation in the main house at Kingston Corner. The proposal seeks to locate this building adjacent to the boundary with the neighbouring property to the south, Sea Barn (which is a Grade II listed building), closer to the neighbouring property than the main house at Kingston Corner.

The design and access statement (p.10) for the proposed two-storey replacement will have a footprint of 129m², 3.8 times larger than the existing single-storey 34m² shed and although smaller than the 181m² footprint of the existing main house, it will have a depth running front to back (west to east) of 26m that exceeds that of the main house (23m). The proposal exceeds the existing building line of the built area of the site at the front (west) and brings it closer to the road in an area in which, generally, buildings are set well back

from the road. In addition the proposal also marginally exceeds the existing building line to the rear (east) of the existing house. The proposed development uses materials that are very different from the existing house. The development will have a footprint that is 71% of the existing main house and its massing is out of keeping with the scale and proportion of the original building. All of the above is contrary to Arun District Council Local Plan policy D DM4 – Extensions and Alterations to Existing Buildings and Kingston Neighbourhood Plan policy KNP7 - Design and Development, section 2(iii).

The design and access statement (p.10) states that the proposed two storey development will have a ridge height of 5m from the ground and that the building will be sunk 1m below ground level, however the elevations and sections show a building with a total height of 6.2m, and a ridge height above the ground of 5.5m. The hedges adjacent to the new development that sit on the border of the boundary between Sea Barn and Kingston Corner have been drawn at 8m, but the hedge that sits on this boundary varies in height between 5.4m and 3.1m at the point where the hedge is adjacent to the development. The section of the hedge that is 4.3m high runs at that height for 13m adjacent to where the proposal is situated. Contrary to the design and access statement that the development 'will be practically invisible' from Sea Barn, the variations in hedge height mean that the proposed development will be clearly visible from ground level at both ridge height and up to 1.3m below ridge height. From the two north facing windows on second storey of Sea Barn, the proposed development will be visible at ridge height and up to 1.2m below ridge height (again variations in the hedge height have been taken into account in these estimations). Notwithstanding the above reduction in privacy, any residual privacy is entirely dependent on the aforementioned privet hedge, a natural barrier - should this be subject to compromise in any way then this would further compromise Sea Barn's sense of privacy and it is noted that the proposed development's 26m depth (west to east), which will run adjacent to Sea Barn, is also longer than the total depth of Sea Barn, which has an equivalent west to east depth of 21m. This is all significant with respect to the visual impact and overpowering and intrusive nature of the proposal on Sea Barn, which is contrary to Arun District Council Local Plan policy D DM4 – Extensions and Alterations to Existing Buildings and Kingston Neighbourhood Plan policy KNP7 - Design and Development, section 1 (i), (iii) and (iv).

Sea Barn is a Grade II listed building, a converted barn built in traditional brick and flint materials. Section 66 of the Listed Building Act 1990 requires that in the case of any new developments close to a listed building, special regard is paid to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed building (which is considered an essential part of any listed building's character). The design of new buildings planned to sit adjacent or alongside a listed building is particularly critical and development would not normally be permitted if it would adversely affect the setting of a listed building. Although detailed consideration of the relationship between the proposed development and Sea Barn is largely absent from the submitted design and access statement, in addition to being clearly visible from Sea Barn the proposed development will also be visible within the general view of Sea Barn itself. Any building that can be seen within the view of a listed building clearly lies within the

setting of a listed building. The proposed development will clearly affect the setting of a listed building.

The design of any proposed development in the environs of a listed building should respect the listed building in terms of scale, massing and alignment and the works proposed should make use of sympathetic materials. The proposed development is overbearing and not in sympathy in terms of scale. The proposed development's weathered steel materials are not in sympathy with the traditional brick and flint materials used in the construction of Sea Barn. Although Sea Barn is not shown in the plans, the site plan when viewed alongside Google Maps appears to show that with respect to alignment, both the western and eastern building lines of the proposed development will sit beyond the building lines of Sea Barn, which is a relevant consideration in assessing the question of massing, the overbearing nature of the proposal and its adverse impact on the setting of a listed building.

In summary:

1. The proposed development is a substantial separate building that will be visually out of scale with, inconsistent in term of design and materials and closer to the road than the existing house at Kingston Corner.
2. The proposed development will be overbearing on a neighbouring property, Sea Barn.
3. The proposed development will be unsympathetic and detrimental to the setting of Sea Barn, a listed building, in terms of general design and situation, size, alignment and use of materials.

Yours sincerely,

James Elliot