

Bexhill Heritage

☎ 01424 575065
🌐 bexhillheritage.org.uk
✉ info@bexhillheritage.org.uk



Caring for Bexhill's past,
present and future.

Rother District Council (Planning Division)
Town Hall
Bexhill-on-Sea
East Sussex TN39 3JX

22 August 2018

Dear Mr Wilson,

RR/2018/900/P Variation of condition 2 imposed on RR/2014/1670/P : approved plans amended to 'as built' on site. Victoria Hall, Victoria Road, Bexhill TN39 3PD

The removal of scaffolding and exposure of extensions and alterations to this previously unmolested example of high quality design has made clear just how damaging were the approved plans, to which Bexhill Heritage would have made the strongest objection had it been in existence at the time.

The current application plans and the “as built” remedial actions have achieved little; indeed, little is realistically possible now apart from the removal of the unacceptable flat modern UPVC window and its replacement with an oriel window to match that which was there originally, and the removal of the recent harmful cement render surrounding the sandstone Queen Victoria roundel replacing with correct lime render as advised to the developer by the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings. Bexhill Heritage urges that these improvements be sought.

There is a considerable discrepancy between the “as built” application description and the Victoria Road elevation “as proposed” on the application plan. The plan implies that the parapet wall will be raised to a level to above that of the bottom of the new top floor windows. On site they are not presently so. The window section on the plan, although somewhat confusing, shows the top of the parapet wall below the level of the bottom of the window. Bexhill Heritage is of the opinion that the wall should be left at its present level, in part at least because the builder is unlikely to be able to produce a good match, as demonstrated by the mortar smudged on the erratic new brick course beneath the concrete coping. If the wall is to be raised, we believe a sample panel should be constructed and be subject to approval before work commences.

A further discrepancy is the dummy window shown on the elevation. In fact, a new window is located here.

These errors should not be present, particularly on plans submitted to regularise works in themselves departures from approved plans.

Yours sincerely,

David Beales (Bexhill Heritage Planning Officer)

Raymond Konyn (Founder, Trustee & Chairman)