

Application Number:	AWDM/1393/25
Location:	PP-14423118
Proposal:	Application to vary condition 1 (Approved Drawings) to include railings, amended entrance gates, entrance ramp, amended patio steps, external land level adjustments, external guard rail to terrace and change of eastern casement window to sash. Amended details now include sustainable surface water drainage. Also variation of the following conditions to require compliance with newly submitted details: 4 - Construction Management Plan 5 - Biodiversity Gain Plan 6 - Landscape & Ecology Management Plan 7 - Surface Water Drainage Details 10 - Details of Windows and Doors 11 - Railings, Gates & Posts 12 - Cycle Parking
Case Officer:	Louise Prew

☐	Further Information Required
☐	Design Review Required
☐	No objection - no harm
☐	No objection - harm is negligible or mitigated
☐	Objection - less than substantial harm
☐	Objection - substantial harm
☐	Objection – Total Loss

Site and Surroundings:	Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 confers a statutory duty to LPAs when exercising planning functions, to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.” The LPA’s duties are reinforced within Section 16 of the NPPF, Heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations. As such, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Other elements held within Section 16 will also be considered as will Local Policy. Settlement in Farncombe Road began with a series of substantial villas in the mid-nineteenth century. This was followed later in the century by 5emi-detached housing. Twentieth century development (illed the empty plots on Church Way and replaced some of the villas.
-------------------------------	---

	All the buildings are set well forward on their plots to produce generous back gardens, yet far enough back from the pavement to give the streets their broad, open aspect. This effect is reinforced by the generous grass verges between road and pavement and by the wide roadways. Mature trees throughout the area, both in gardens and verges, create a pleasant setting for the buildings. Well-kept original red brick pavements also contribute to the area's settled, long-established appearance, though some have been replaced by driveways and man-hole covers. Low boundary walls of boulder-flints with red-brick bandings and piers, provide an attractive division between garden and thoroughfare for most properties. They are a significant part of the street scene. The building lines follow the road, with most houses being set 8-10 metres from the edge of the pavement; this, and the generous spacing between the houses affords a series of changing vistas to anyone travelling along Farncombe Road. The essential architectural character of the area is defined by its large villas. The prevalent features of these include:- • Two, occasionally three, storeys. • Proportions: mostly double-fronted (3 bays). with over-all height, length and width being roughly equal. • Shallow-pitched, hipped roofs in natural slate. • White stucco or yellow brick elevations. • Canted bays. • Timber sashes with horns - single or double paned. • String course dividing ground and first floors. • Decorative eaves cornice. • Quoining - vermiculated (eg No. 6 Farncombe Road and Nos. 101-103 Brighton Road) or plain (eg No. 9 Farncombe Road). • Classically inspired doorways, with columns, pilasters, consoles etc. • Four or six panelled wooden doors. The application seeks to vary approved plans from a previously consented scheme to include variations to entrance gates, windows, railings amongst other aspects. Many of the drawings relate to previous conditions which are sought discharge so not to be placed on any forthcoming permission.
Drawing Errors:	
Comments:	In respect of the proposed Metal railings the detail provided is insufficient and should be supplied at 1:10 elevations and 1:2 sections. It is also noted that fixed railings are mounted on a dwarf wall in terms of the existing and this should be repeated at the front of the boundary for any fixed additional fencing. Piers should

	be utilised to terminate dwarf walls and provide a suitable hinge location for an entrance gate. King posts may also be required to support the railings. The metal railings around the light wells is excessive and should be removed and another less intrusive arrangement should be considered such as slightly raised brickwork?? The proposed boundary railing appears too inconsistent and presents itself as a harmful proposed boundary treatment undermining the streetscape presentation of the building and having a wider adverse impact on character. In relation to the sash window, where a proposed sash could be supported once again these should be in 1:10 elevations and 1:2 sections (horizontal and vertical) with the surrounding aperture shown for context for each window. This also applies in relation to the rooflights. Only slim double glazing will be accepted with genuine glazing bars, the glazing bars specified are too wide and stick on. The bottom rail is considered to be too small but should be checked and confirmed (supply a accompanying photo of the bottom rail of an existing window with a measure tape on it) There is no confirmation as to the materiality of the proposed windows, this should be specified on the drawing Finally the bin stores is not located clearly on amended drawings to the front of the building and there is no indication of its appearance. This is also required. In summary the proposed will result in a poor overall appearance of overly large or small section sizes for windows in a unconfirmed materiality, the railings depart from established character and are of insufficient detail, no detail of bin stores or rooflights have been supplied and the fencing in of light wells seems excessive, in combination theses aspects will result in harm to the host building and wider chacater of the conservation area with no justification that is either clear and convincing or in the public interest, particularly as it is also considered avoidable harm. As such the proposed should be considerably amended or a refusal of planning permission issued.
Design Review:	

Simon Richard
Conservation Consultant for and on behalf of Adur and Worthing District Council
Date of Comment 2/2/26