

From: Brian Banister <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 19 March 2025 12:58
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: Arun Conservation Area Advisory Panel comments on applications

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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.

Hello,

The **Arun Conservation Area Advisory Panel** wish the following comments to be taken into consideration in the determination of the applications:

AB/24/25/HH - 5 St Mary's Gate Mews, London Road, Arundel

Objection

The property forms part of a modest, relatively modern terrace of vernacular design which is prominent in both the London Road and Mount Pleasant street scenes.

The terrace reads as a single, composite, structure and it is important that, given the sensitive heritage asset context, there is a consistency of detail, materials and finishes throughout. As such, the Panel consider that the windows should be painted to match those of the other properties in the terrace.

The Panel also regret the loss of part of the existing hedge which is more appropriate in the street scene than a view of a vehicular crossing and parking area.

There appears to be an inconsistency on Dwg no 3266/01/01 in that there is one note explaining that the windows (presumably the existing ones) are intended to be painted sage green but there is another note which mentions that "New windows and doors to be uPVC double glazed ..". If any new windows are proposed then perhaps details of them, including material and opening mechanism, should be provided.

AB/25/25/HH - Houghton House, 4 Arun Street, Arundel

No Objection

It is considered that the proposals will have no adverse impact on the character or appearance of the conservation area.

It is suggested that more precise details of the new double doors and of the new rooflight (conservation style preferred) should be required.

Note: Cllr Carolyn Kenney declared an interest as applicant and left the room during the Panel's consideration of the application and took no part in it. Ms Aldis-Hobbs, as agent, was absent from the meeting.

AL/22/25/HH - 28 Church Road, Aldingbourne

No Objection

It is considered that the proposed works will not harm the character or appearance of the conservation area.

It is recommended that the new clay tiles should match, as far as possible, those on the existing roof.

BR/32/25/PL - Trevali Lodge, 31 Aldwick Road, Bognor Regis

Objection

Although there are some differences in the main facades, nos 31 and 33 Aldwick Road clearly read as a robust, Edwardian, semi-detached pair of dwellings. It would not take too much work to bring them to a condition whereby they would make a positive, rather than neutral, contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The existing windows on the principal facade are painted timber vertically sliding sashes and, as such, they are important traditional features which should be repaired or replaced 'like for like' in materials and operating mechanism (they could include slimline double glazed panes). The loss of such traditional features is always detrimental to the appearance of a conservation area. The proposal to replace them even with pvcu vertically sliding sashes, and any others with pvcu, will detract from the appearance of the property and the conservation area.

The note on the left hand side of Dwg no 4090/01/06 rather ambiguously implies that soffits and fascias will be replaced in pvcu. This requires clarification because if it is the case then there will be the further loss of traditional features to the detriment of the building and the conservation area. Timber soffits, fascias and bargeboards can never successfully be replaced or encased with pvcu without losing the subtlety of shape, form, proportions and texture of the originals.

The Panel are also concerned at the loss of the flint boundary wall on the eastern boundary of the site. Flint walling is an important characteristic of this particular conservation area and any loss can only harm its heritage significance. Traditional flint walling is a finite feature and every effort should be made to retain it. If lost then it should be replaced and that is the view of the Panel in this instance. Replacement of the wall in brick is not sufficient. If the Council agrees, then a sample panel of flintwork requires to be provided in-situ for the Conservation Officer's agreement.

The Panel welcome some of the changes made since the last planning application but the proposal, for the reasons explained, is still considered to be detrimental to the appearance of the building and the conservation area in conflict with the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF and policies contained in the ADLP relating to the protection and enhancement of local distinctiveness and of heritage assets.

R/29/25/L - Pound Cottage, 28 The Street, Rustington

No Objection

The Panel welcomed the necessary repairs and the approach taken.

Y/15/25/PL and Y/16/25/L - Stakers Farm, North End Road, Yapton

Objection

The farm buildings and the related farmhouse are very important and impressive reminders of the agricultural basis of the village.

The Panel do not object to the conversion of the farm buildings to a limited number of dwellings as long as it is carried out to historic building repair standard and in a manner which conforms to Historic England's guidance on such conversions.

The Panel consider that the proposed fenestration needs significant improvement in design and appearance. It currently appears overly domestic in appearance and does not reflect the nature and character of the specific building types.

It also queries the need to totally replace the clay roof tiles to the main buildings albeit in a very high quality clay tile. Total replacement will mean the loss of the patina which is an attractive feature of the buildings. If, however, there is a proven need to replace the existing tiles in order to better protect the structures for the future then clearly the Panel would not object in that instance.

The same clay roof tile to be used on the existing buildings also needs to be used on the roofs of the new outbuildings and the exact colour and tone of the stain to be used in the fenestration of the buildings also needs to be established.

Kind regards

Brian Banister MRTPI(Rtd), GradDiplConsAA
On behalf of ACAAP