

## Derek Price

---

**From:** Derek Price  
**Sent:** 01 November 2017 16:44  
**To:** Colin Kiely (crk@kielyplanning.co.uk)  
**Cc:** John Saunders (Jsaunders@chichester.gov.uk)  
**Subject:** Courts Yard, Jobsons Lane, Lurgashall  
**Attachments:** Alternative plan forms.pdf

Dear Colin

### **Pre-application reference SDNP/17/02011/PRE: Redevelopment of Courts Yard**

Firstly, may I apologise once again for the delay in providing you with a response to the conceptual lanes and plans for the above development.

In terms of the layout shown as Scheme G, this is much improved in terms of the spatial relationship between buildings and the limits of the site itself. The lower density is more reflective of the sporadic, dispersed character of development found within the locality.

However, I am more than slightly disappointed with the interpretation of the 'farmstead' concept we has agreed on with respect to the actual design approaches to the individual units, particularly Plots 1 and 4, which I expand upon below:

#### **Plot 1**

Firstly, the front and rear renditions do not appear to correspond to the plan form shown on the indicative layout: the elevations seem to be handed when compared with the latter plan.

Unfortunately, I regret that the design does not really reflect the traditional character or appearance of vernacular rural dwellings of the type envisaged in my initial pre-application advice. The suggested design seem too generic and suburban in character and incorporates an overly complicated plan form, giving rise to quite a fussy articulation. Features such as the balustrading and false timber detailing, heavy barge boards and disproportionately sized dormer windows and other fenestration simply reinforce this suburban character.

In my opinion, the dwelling should adopt a much more simple form, with for example, a main axis and a subsidiary wing at the rear (perpendicular to or parallel with) or at the side. I attach sketches of alternative plan forms to try and illustrate this. In terms of elevational treatment, again the dwelling would benefit from a uncluttered, balanced appearance, with an eaves line at or just above first floor window heads, exposed rafter feet, and in the instance of a gabled roof form, brick detailing to the verges.

#### **Plot 4**

The reflection of a functional rural building such as a barn is overwhelmed by the overtly domestic appearance of the suggested design. The large scale openings and their regular distribution across the elevation as illustrated, together with the full two-storey form do not reflect the more intimate detailing associated with vernacular rural buildings. There should, for example, be narrower openings with greater vertical emphasis to their proportions. I would add that the central gable feature appears somewhat weak in terms of its representation of a wagon entrance, particularly when seen in the context of the scale of the rest of the building. I am not sure if you have had the opportunity, but there would undoubtedly be an advantage in looking at the style and form of traditional rural buildings (both converted and unconverted) found in the area to better inform the style and proportions of such buildings and which could be incorporated into a refined design.

The length of the garaging associated with this plot could usefully be increased by one bay and potentially moved so that it links with the main building to make a subsidiary wing similar to a cart barn – again something that is commonly seen associated with such buildings.

## Plots 1 and 2

The general concept is considered to be fine, although I am concerned that the plan depth is too great, resulting in a built form that competes with the main unit (plot 1) in terms of scale. In my view the plan depth should be reduced to under 6.0m to give the dwellings a much more slender form. There would be no objection to adding a modest wing to the rear (for example) as a means to redress the level of accommodation that might otherwise be compromised. (See attached sketch). I am also concerned that the elevations appear over-fenestrated and the proposed are rather ornate and impart a higher status than might be expected in the context of the design concept as a whole. These should be simpler in form, preferably integral with the end elevations as opposed to an addition to the external faces.

Unfortunately I have only had limited access to our SDNPA systems today due to upgrades taking place as I was hoping to provide you with some better ideas of what I am trying to convey. However once the system is operative again, I will do so.

As I said, I would be more than happy to discuss these observations in more detail, either in person or over the phone if you felt it helpful to develop this concept further.

Kind regards



**Derek Price**

Principal Planning Officer  
National Park  
Chichester District Council

Ext: 34560 | Tel: 01243534734 | [dprice@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:dprice@chichester.gov.uk) | Fax: 01243 776766

<http://www.chichester.gov.uk>

