

[REDACTED]

From: Hannah Riddle on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 15 June 2022 16:35
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: P/60/22/PL

[REDACTED]

Hannah Riddle
Planning Apprentice
Planning Services



[REDACTED]

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

Please note I am on study leave on Thursdays.

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: Martyn White [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 June 2022 15:22
To: Planning.Responses [REDACTED]
Subject: P/60/22/PL

P/60/22/PL

Grey Barn Church Lane Pagham PO21 4NX

Replace existing conservatory with front porch, single storey rear extension and dormer windows. Extension of existing garage and part conversion to tourist accommodation. This application may affect the setting of a Listed Building.

Grey Barn is a period barn conversion being of render elevations under a pitched slate roof. A structure in a similar location appears on the Tithe map and is clearly present by the 1875-90 map of Pagham.

It is an attractive one and a half / two storey building former barn that has been converted into residential use. One of the gable walls appears to be built of the local Bognor Rock, with brick detailing, whilst the other walls appear to be rendered and painted. There is a slate half hip roof and two chimneys of brick construction. Multi-paned casement windows, all painted white appear to be suitable for the building.

Also of note is a single garage/outbuilding which along with an attractive flint wall forms a courtyard area. This flint walling is of good quality and looks to be in good condition.

The building forms a group with the neighbouring listed buildings and makes a positive impact upon the street scene.

Whilst Grey Barn has is not a listed building or a locally listed building, it is an attractive structure and of an age which means that it can be identified as a non-designated heritage asset. As you are aware the Planning Practice Guidance states that it can be helpful if local planning authorities keep a local list of non-designated heritage assets, it also acknowledges that "In some cases, local planning authorities may also identify non-designated heritage assets as part of the decision-making process on planning applications". The building does not fall within a conservation area.

There are also three Listed Building to the north and east of the building:

- Little Welbourne
- Garage of Little Welborne to the west of the house
- The Old Vicarage

Little Welbourne is a Grade II listed Building Two parallel ranges. Front range dated 1709. Two storeys. Three windows. Faced with stone-rubble, white-washed. Thatched roof. Casements, those on the first floor being the original tiny windows. Back range C19. It is of architectural and historical significance. Little Welbourne is experienced from the lane to the front and is partly experienced in the same views as Grey Barn.

Garage of Little Welborne to the west of the house II C18 outbuilding of stone rubble with hipped thatched roof. Built into the back wall are some remains of the medieval chapel of St Andrew. C11 chancel arch, blocked in the C16, two small windows and one doorway, all blocked. It is separated from Grey Barn by a dense tree line which removed intervisibility between the two structures. It is of architectural and historical significance.

The Vicarage is a mid- to later C18 house extended or altered to the rear, probably by the early to mid-C19, and altered again in the later C19 and early C20. It is listed, Grade II.

The house is two storeys, and consists of two parallel ranges, the front range under a single hipped roof, the south-western and central bays, and the south-eastern bay of the rear range above the kitchen, under two separate hipped roofs.

The walls are limestone rubble, stone quoins to the north-facing entrance front and ground floor of south-east angle, elsewhere brick quoins; brick storey band, dentil course and flush red brick dressings to windows; north and east elevations painted. Rear bathroom wing weatherboarded. Tile roofs. There is a mixture of casement and sash windows present, all painted white.

Traditionally the vicarage, and close to the site of the C13 chapel of St Andrew, within the historic village of Pagham, which was a major medieval port. It is adjacent to the former Chapel of St Andrew, the remains of which stand in the garden of Little Welbourne, an early C18 house (Grade II), where the chapel is listed at Grade II as The Garage of Little Welbourne. It is of architectural and historical significance.

The listed building is located behind Grey Barn and is separated by a dense tree line and a garage building.

The Proposal

The proposal is identified within the heritage statement as consisting of the following:

- Replacement of an existing Conservatory with an oak framed front porch

- Single storey extension to the rear
- Alteration/relocation of one dormer window and separate additional dormer window
- Extension of the existing garage and ancillary store
- Part conversion of the ancillary store to form self-catering tourist accommodation

The removal of the existing conservatory will result in the loss of a poorly designed structure of inappropriate materials. This will enable the elevation to be better viewed and appreciated. The replacement oak framed porch appears to be designed so that it is sympathetic to the building and will have a positive impact. It is assumed that the oak will be left to silver, is this correct?

The single storey extension to provide a utility is cleverly designed in that the roofline follows that of the existing house, and will replicate the existing materials. However, will all three elevation be in matching stone? If so, will this be the same stone as the gable? Whilst the use of the stone is acceptable, this would be subject to details of the materials and a sample panel. If alternate materials are also to be used on some of the elevations, I would need to understand what these would be. Such information can be provided for by way of condition.

The additional windows do not seem to be causing harm and are reflective of the existing ones. It is very positive to understand that all of the UPVC windows will be replaced with traditional painted timber ones. It would help it understand more about these windows and details could be provided by way of condition. This would need to include details of their design/appearance, specification, glazing bars, glazing, method of opening, location within the window opening and finish. Such information should be provided in the form of drawings and sections of an appropriate scale.

Whilst the description states 'extension to existing garage', the plans make it look more like the existing garage is to be predominantly replaced by a new structure. I have assessed the plans on that basis.

Whilst the existing garage structure is clearly subservient to the main dwelling, it is not of good quality. However, there are some positive elements to it; it forms a courtyard to the main dwelling and there are some positive materials present (albeit in the wall to be demolished). Whilst the loss of the building/substantial alteration is acceptable, the positive materials should be retained on site and reused as part of the proposal.

The new building has clearly been designed so that it reflects elements of the dwelling such as the barn hipped roof, and use of materials. It is also positive to note that the windows and doors will be timber and the existing masonry wall to the south and east elevation will be repointed in appropriate materials – details could be provided by way of condition to ensure they are appropriate for the building. The existing positive materials i.e. stone should be reserved and reused as part of the new building. I am also of the opinion that, subject to the use of high quality materials and finishes, that it will form an acceptable element of the street-scene. Such a view will ensure that views of Little Welbourne will not be affected.

The change of use to tourist accommodation would be within an existing residential curtilage and would not seem to cause harm. It is essentially an additional residential unit within a small group of houses. Further, the introduction of such a use is considered to ensure the long term maintenance of the building, the previous version of which was not maintained and detrimental to the non-designated heritage asset. I note that a new means of dividing the courtyard would be introduced. It would help to understand what this would look like/what materials and treatment would be used. Such information could be provided for by way of a condition.

Conclusion

The proposals have been carefully prepared so as to ensure that they do not detract from the existing building or the setting of the neighbouring listed buildings. It is positive to note that where inappropriate change has previously been undertaken that the intention is to reverse this. For instance, the replacement windows will be an enhancement, subject to their design/details.

The application is therefore considered to not cause harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset or the setting of the listed buildings. As a consequence, it should be determined in accordance with the relevant policies within the Development Plan, along with these comments. You will also need to take into account the contents of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

Martyn White

Principal Conservation Officer,
Planning Services



Please note: I work on Conservation for half of the working week (all day Monday and Friday and Tuesday Afternoons)

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

www.arun.gov.uk

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please click on the link below

<https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>

