



**CDC Planning Consultation
Response from the Historic Buildings Adviser**

Application Number	PS/12/01933/DOM
Address	Southlands Cottage, Loxwood
Description	Two storey extension replacing single storey extension.
Case Officer	Sarah Crease
Site Visit	5 July 2012

No Objection

A building on the site of Southlands Cottage and in more or less the right orientation, known as Wharf House, is shown on the 1842 Alford Tithe Map to the north-west of what appears to be a large farm holding called Southlands Farm. Given the name and location of this building in relation to the canal, it is a possibility that the building dates from the same period as the canal, c.1816, and that the building functioned as a wharf house for it. Alternatively, box framing on the elevations may suggest an earlier date.

London's Lost Route to the Sea by P.A.L. Vine also identifies a lock called Southland to the south of the cottage, and in the general vicinity of the farm. According to the tithe apportionment, the field in which this structure and the lock stands belonged to the nearby Southlands Farm, which was demolished sometime before 1875 as it is noticeably absent from the First Edition OS maps. It was at this time that the name is transferred to the building now known as Southlands Cottage.

If this building is in fact associated with the canal, its survival, although much altered, is particularly interesting. Internally the building also retains many historic elements, including the stairs and exposed timber roof framing. At the very least, we would consider it a Heritage Asset under the terms of the NPPF.

The current scheme is a resubmission of a previously approved scheme (07/03996/DOM) which was considered acceptable on the basis that it did not cause 'demonstrable harm'. This assessment does not appear to have considered the historic merits of the building. That said, the approach is generally acceptable.



It should be noted, however, that the use of a crown roof and the scope of the link might not normally be supported under current legislation and guidance relating to the historic environment. An exception may be made where considered justified. In this instance, avoiding the Horsham slate roof, and rationalization of structural issues appear to justify these elements.

Ideally, we would have pulled the west elevation of the extension towards the east, so as to sit behind the existing structure, as opposed to sitting forward of the historic elevation. A more appropriate solution, from a design point of view, might have been to omit the 'link' and create a mirror volume, reminiscent of many Victorian extensions.

The loss of historic fabric (i.e. the existing catslide to the north) is also slightly concerning. An analysis of historic mapping seems to suggest that the building was originally oriented north-south at the west end of the building. An east-west wing was then added in line with the south elevation to create an 'L' shape. The corner of the 'L' was then later partially filled in so that the building reads as an east-west range, with an outshot to the north which does not extend the entire length of the building. An on-site assessment of the fabric, however, was not conclusive in this respect. As such, the loss is considered acceptable.

Heather Hall
Assistant Historic Buildings Adviser