Expiry Date – 18/3, EOT agreed to 27/3

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0086/20 Recommendation – Grant

Site: **Ivy Cottage, 55 The Green, Southwick**

Proposal: **Demolition of existing pier and wall (north): proposed 1.8m tapered boarded fence and gate to West (within garden) and proposed flint and brick pier wall to West boundary 2.2m high**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 3/3

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a Grade II listed two storey house on the west side of The Green and junction with Church Lane. The property has coursed cobblestones to front and rear elevations and a mansarded roof.

The front and rear gardens are enclosed with flint walls. The front gardens of house to the west in Church Lane are also, largely, enclosed with flint wall. The western boundary shared with 1 Church Lane has a mixed boundary of flint wall and panel fencing. The flint wall appears to be part of an earlier outbuilding which existed prior to Church Lane houses being built.

Vehicle access is from Church Lane immediately behind the house itself though a piered entrance.

Proposal

Permission is sought to demolish a second internal pier and short length of wall on the west side of the vehicle entrance together with a low wall which encloses the raised flower bed and rear lawn area. A new 1.8 metre high close boarded fence will enclose the lawn area making the rear garden more private from the street. The extended driveway will be resurfaced with brindle block paviours.

In addition the western boundary wall/fence is to be removed and replaced with a 2.1 metre high brick wall with brick piers and coursed flint between on its west side.

Relevant Planning History

None relevant.

Consultations

Adur Conservation Advisory Group:

'This house is a well know prominent feature located on the west side of Southwick Green, the Green itself being the central focal point in the Southwick Conservation area where both the former Southwick UDC and latterly, Adur D.C have supported the policy of preserving/maintaining the numerous examples of knapped Sussex flint walls which prevail throughout.

There are two separate alterations proposed, the first involving the removal of a modern pier and border to be replaced by fencing which members can accept.

However, the border at the western limit of the garden which comprises a mix of an ancient flint wall and recent modern fencing gives members cause for serious concern particularly in view of the aforementioned policy in Para 1.

It is recommended that it would be preferable if the old wall could be retained as a component of the proposed new flint wall. Not to do so would create a dangerous precedent in regard to future applications involving knapped Sussex flint.'

Highways: *No objection.*

Representations

None received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2019
Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2,15 and 17
Southwick conservation area appraisal

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development can be supported as it upgrades a dwelling within the built up area boundary. For consideration is the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area and the impacts of the development on neighbour amenity.

Neighbour Impact

There is no neighbour harm.

Conservation Area

The loss of the vehicle access pier, short length of entrance wall and low garden wall are insignificant as these are not original features. The panel fencing proposed to

enclose the rear garden is reasonable to enable the applicant to privately enjoy their rear garden.

The western boundary is more complicated. Its mixed flint element appears to be the remnant of a former outbuilding retained and added to with fencing to form boundary to the more recent plot adjoining, 1 Church Lane.

Para 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that:

'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'

The loss of this small area of flint wall is considered to result in less than significant harm to the setting of the listed building itself and to the conservation area. It does not front the public highway, as others do, and is only partial. The applicant states that it is in a poor state of repair and cannot be saved as part of a new wall enclosure, it would not withstand a new wall being built incorporating it.

The Conservation Area Appraisal notes the prominence of flint walls, the positive contribution they make and encourages their retention.

In this case however, it is considered that the removal and replacement of the wall will result in a public benefit both to the applicant, in terms of securing their garden safely, and more widely. A new coursed flint faced wall is an acceptable alternative in this particular case. Other more prominent boundaries retain their flint boundary walls and it is only the particular circumstances in this case that justifies its replacement as proposed.

The resurfacing of the driveway is acceptable. The existing drive is a tarmac or similar. Brindle block paving is an acceptable alternative.

Conclusion

Less than significant harm will occur to this listed building and the proposal preserves and in part enhances the appearance of the conservation area.

Recommendation APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved Plans
2. 3 years
3. Sample of flint work/brick for western boundary wall

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received

and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? YES.

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 20.3.2020
Authorised and signed by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 23 March 2020