

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

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

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



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

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

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



From: Brian Banister

Sent: 02 February 2022 16:13

To: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: LU/13/22/PL - Pharos Quay, River Road, Littlehampton - Alterations to fenestration and openings.

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.

The **Arun District Conservation Area Advisory Panel** wish to make the following representations in respect of the above planning application:

Objection

Pharos Quay, predominantly 3 stories in height, comprises two blocks; one fronting Terminus Road and the second fronting River Road. The buildings date to the early 1990's and are of a high quality traditional, quasi-vernacular, design with excellent detailing, proportions and materials. They include a series of distinctive and prominent gabled roofs which reflect the roof forms of historic buildings in Terminus and River Road.

Finely well detailed and proportioned traditional features such as the barge-boarding, slender eaves fascias not extending below underside of guttering, soffits recessed from fascia undersides and bargeboard edges, and exposed and cut rafter feet are extremely important to the appearance and character of the buildings. These attractive painted timber eaves and bargeboard details are intrinsic to the design of the buildings and ensure that they make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The loss of such traditional detailing in buildings would very quickly erode the appearance and heritage significance of the conservation area. The building comprising nos 1-23 Pharos Quay on the Terminus Road frontage is an extremely prominent and attractive feature at the western end of the conservation area and its form, design and detailing echoes that of historic and modern buildings further along the road. It is located between the Local List buildings West End Terrace to the east and The Steam Packet to the west and, therefore, forms an important part of the setting of these non-designated heritage assets.

The second building (nos 24-41 Pharos Quay) is located, again prominently, in River Road. It lies opposite 49 River Road, a Local List building and nearby are the Local List former warehouse buildings (47 River Road). The facades of these latter buildings have been integrated into the innovative and contemporary design of a block of flats designed by John Pardey. The Pharos Quay building forms part of the setting of all these structures.

The Panel object to the proposal for the following reasons:

(1) the Heritage Statement indicates that it is proposed to both enclose (box in) the existing timber eaves and replace the timber bargeboards with pvcu fascias and soffits. The importance of the existing eaves and bargeboard detailing to the character of the buildings and, therefore, their contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area has been described above. To replace these very important fine details with what will be bulky, visually clumsy and crude, totally inappropriate, pvcu components will materially detract from, and harm, the appearance and character of the buildings and the conservation area.

(2) it is unfortunate that the original painted timber windows were not vertically sliding sashes which would have been far more appropriate than the current top hung, 'false', sashes. However, to replace these existing timber units with pvcu ones and of the same operating mechanism will further detract from the appearance of the buildings. The following fenestration materials and operating mechanisms are suggested, in order of preference, to protect the character of the buildings and the conservation area :

(a) vertically sliding painted timber sash windows which would be totally in keeping with the character of the buildings,

(b) vertically sliding white powder coated aluminium sash windows which would provide more slender proportions than pvcu ones and which would have a far more appropriate opening mechanism than top hung, 'false', sashes.

(c) the Panel does not support the use of pvcu fenestration but if the Council comes to the unfortunate view that it will not be possible to object to pvcu for window replacement on this particular site then, at the least, it should require that the new windows are vertically sliding sashes. This far more appropriate operating mechanism would go towards ameliorating , to some extent, the adverse impact of pvcu. However, perhaps it should be made clear in an Informative that the grant of planning permission should not be taken as a precedent for the use of pvcu fenestration elsewhere in the conservation area. (There is no solution involving pvcu which would in any way address the Panel's objections to reason (1), though.)

(3) for the reasons mentioned above, the proposals will materially detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area and the settings of adjoining and nearby non-designated heritage assets.

(4) the proposals will materially detract from the traditional appearance of buildings which, even though relatively modern, make a distinctly positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area through their design and the high quality traditional detailing mentioned.

(5) the grant of planning permission could well set a very unfortunate precedent making it difficult for the Council to resist similar inappropriate alterations to other buildings in the conservation area to the further detriment of its character and appearance.

For these reasons it is considered that the proposals fail to comply with the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF and policies contained in the ADLP relating to the protection of conservation areas, local distinctiveness, and the settings of non-designated heritage assets and planning permission should be refused.

I should be pleased if these representations could be taken into account in the determination of the planning application.

Kind regards

Brian Banister

On behalf of ADCAAP

(In case it is required, my address is 86 Orchard Way, Barnham, Bognor Regis, West Sussex, PO22 0HY)