






From: Martyn White
Sent: 31 May 2019 12:02
To: Zac Denton
Subject: LY/4/19/HH

LY/4/19/HH

The property has been identified by the Council as a Locally Listed Building or Structure of Character. As such it is considered to be a heritage asset for the purposes of planning policy. Further the property is located within the Lyminster Conservation Area which is a designated heritage asset.

As part of paragraph 189 of the NPPF, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected as part of their proposals, including any contribution made by their setting, in determining applications. It does not appear that such information has been submitted as part of this application, which ideally should be submitted at the same time as the application. In light of this, some comments are provided based on my own assessment/observations.

Lyminster is a small, attractive rural settlement located between the towns of Littlehampton and Arundel. As noted within the Conservation area statement, it is characterised by buildings of various scale, style, date and materials. There is an informality of layout enhanced by mature landscaping and verges. Flint walling is also an important feature of the area.

The agricultural basis of the settlement is echoed in several buildings in the village which are vernacular in appearance. The property itself is a flint fronted cottage which forms one end of a terrace of three similar properties, although it is the only one fronted in flint. The applicant helpfully states that the original cottage is thought to date from the 19th century, but that reading the structure it may possibly be of earlier origin. It was formerly used as the village post office and still retains a post box, inset into the front elevation.

The cottage fronts directly onto Church Lane, which is an attractive and tranquil road, which leads to the church of St Madeline. The lane has a mix of architectural styles and buildings, dating from various periods. There are views direct to the north over open fields towards Arundel.

The cottage has already been extended with a substantial single storey, side extension being constructed during the latter part of the 20 century. The Design and Access Statement helpfully indicates that this wing replaced an earlier store building and is T-shaped with a forward projecting range into the street scene. This extension already forms a substantial extension to the older cottage.

The proposal consists of what appear to be two elements; a single storey extension and a first floor side extension, which shall be discussed in turn below.

Single storey rear extension

The single storey rear extension would be an addition to the modern part of the property, and of a scale which would mean that it could remain subservient to the host dwelling. Further, it would not be visible from the lane which would mean that it would not harm the character or appearance of the conservation area. The success of this element of the proposal would be dependent upon the quality of the materials and joinery to be used.

Although saying that, the loss of the chimney is unfortunate as it is visible from the lane.

A positive feature of the proposal is the replacement rear casement window with something more in keeping with the property, along with the loss of the two upper level rooflights.

First floor side extension

The overall scale of the development is substantial and would be of a size as to make this part of the property (i.e. the modern extension and new works) appear larger than the existing, original cottage. It is considered that the new roof would appear to be larger than that of the existing cottage, and therefore not subservient to the host dwelling. It would therefore have an overbearing impact, which it is considered would dominate the street-scape and be out of keeping with the character of both the host dwelling and the immediate area.

It would also look like a separate unit of accommodation has been created, forming a fourth unit to the terrace, as opposed to a subservient extension to an existing property.

It is also not clear why a half hip has been proposed, when the existing two storey elements of the terrace have gabled elevations. This feature is repeated elsewhere in the conservation area.

Consequently, it is considered that the extension would not preserve the building, or the character or appearance of the conservation area.

The proposal is such that the impact can be described as causing less than substantial harm in accordance with paragraph 196 of the NPPF (2018). 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 section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

For your information, the Planning Practice Guidance states that public benefits include:

- sustaining or enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting
- reducing or removing risks to a heritage asset
- securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset in support of its long term conservation

Martyn White | Principal Conservation Officer, Planning Policy, Directorate of Place, [Arun District Council](#) | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Internal: 37717 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737717 | E-mail: Martyn.white@arun.gov.uk

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.