

**ADC Planning Consultation
Response from the Historic Buildings Adviser**

Application Number	P/105/14/PL
Address	Sefter Farm, Pagham
Description	Demolition of agricultural store and extension to agricultural building.
Case Officer	Simon Davis
Site Visit	26 November 2014

No Objection subject to amendment

This scheme seeks to extend on application P/99/14/L by proposing a further larger addition to the south. The width of the proposed building is such that it results in a higher ridge level, but also appears to produce a structure of considerable bulk and massing. Seen in context with the listed building, it is likely to represent a level of harm to its appreciation and thus its setting.

A more direct impact is the loss of a section of wall and encroachment into the historic farm yard which is evident on historic mapping. This wall is of interest as a farm boundary, as well as being made up of various materials including, flint, brick and what appears to be Bognor rock. Other areas of the wall have already been replaced by brick sections meaning that any surviving sections may be considered to be of greater value.

The issue of setting is slightly complicated by existing commercial buildings to the west, one of which would be demolished, however seen purely as impact, there has to be an acceptance here that a level of harm to the listed building and its setting would be created by the scheme and as such conflicts with paras 131 and 132 of the Framework.

It should be noted that the value of setting is not reliant on public amenity or access, nor is screening by plants or trees recognized in historic environment terms, as an appropriate means of mitigation. Any impacts should be designed out wherever possible. Similarly, the loss of the historic wall is not ideal given its relationship to the heritage asset and contribution to the site more generally. The re-use of the materials elsewhere does little to mitigate this, though if this were to happen, repairs to the existing boundary would be perhaps more satisfactory than forming a stone boundary that did not formerly exist and might be misconstrued. The preservation of setting is sought under para 137 of the Framework.

Given these concerns, we would suggest a compromise in which the proposed building was reduced to approximately half its size to reduce

Please note: The observations and comments expressed on this sheet are the views of the consultee concerned and are in no way binding on either the Council or its senior officers when making a decision on the application. Applicants or their agents should contact the case officer before acting on these views.

massing in the setting, but also avoid the loss of the wall and courtyard. A smaller building, or component of the extension could be maintained where the current building is located and would be approximately the same size. This would provide about 75% of the proposed floor area, though obviously less cubic volume. If this is not feasible then justification for the proposal should be considered in potentially broader terms in accordance with para 134 of the Framework.

Ian Wightman

Senior Historic Buildings Adviser

Please note: The observations and comments expressed on this sheet are the views of the consultee concerned and are in no way binding on either the Council or its senior officers when making a decision on the application. Applicants or their agents should contact the case officer before acting on these views.