expires 28/9/09

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0299/09 Recommendation - Permit

Site: **15 West Street Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5WF**

Proposal: **Two rear dormers and single-storey extension to south side of rear projection**

The Application

The application relates to a mid-terraced Victorian house dating from 1847 located on the west side of the street. The site is located within Shoreham Conservation Area with the rear of the house facing towards 112-118 Old Shoreham Road which are located outside of the Conservation Area.

The dwelling itself appears to have been originally designed as the southern half of a pair of semi-detached houses, with a traditional two-storey rear projecting element, resulting in the characteristic 'L' shaped house. To the rear is a single-storey extension with sloping roof. Attached to the south is another house (No.13) 'Tara' which has the appearance of an infill dwelling due to the irregularity of the shape of its curtilage. It has a wide rear garden which sharply narrows to a long strip looking west, with a high hedge and part of the application dwelling making up the eastern 7m of the north side boundary.

The proposals are for a loft conversion with two dormers (as amended) and a single-storey rear infill extension towards the southern boundary. The two proposed dormers would be 1.1m wide, by 1.3m in height. They would be of traditional design with rolled lead dormer cheeks and sliding sash windows, which would serve an additional bedroom. The infill extension would attach to the existing rear extension and infill the narrow gap towards the southern boundary with No.13. It would have a part tiled sloping roof and part flat roof. It would be 6m in length, and would be 2.5m – 1.4m in width.

Consultations and Representations

West Sussex County Council: The Conservation Architect states that the proposed dormer is deemed to be excessive in the roof-scape. However he feels that two small dormers with side casements or sliding sashes would be acceptable.

The Highways Officer states that additional bedrooms could impact on on-street parking in the area, however any such intensification is not anticipated to raise a highway safety concern. It is noted that waiting restrictions for vehicles are present in areas of West Street.

Adur District Conservation Advisory Group: Feel that the front treatment is OK but the rear dormer is far too large for the roof and is therefore out of scale. They feel the application should be rejected on these grounds.

Third Parties: There have been two letters of representation regarding the application. The owner of 17 West Street (attached to the north) state that they have no objections to the application which they totally support.
To the south the owner of 'Tara' (No.13) say that they have no objections in principle to the development, and that they have met with the applicant regarding the intention to build the proposed new boundary wall of the extension in a style to their satisfaction, and to match an existing wall. Revisions to the size of the dormer would be welcomed.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AB4, AH7 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' ccmprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.'
PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies
There is a statutory duty to pay attention to the need to preserve or enhance Conservation Areas. Local Plan policy AB4 also requires design and construction materials be of a high standard.

Policy AH7 of the Local Plan, relates specifically to extensions and alterations to dwellings, it states that they should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable loss of light or privacy or have an overbearing effect on the neighbouring dwelling and be sympathetic to the original dwelling.

Supplementary Planning Guidance in DC Standard No. 3 'Extension and Alteration to Dwellings' states that single-storey extensions within a metre of the boundary should usually be no longer that 3.5m in length, to prevent an overbearing effect and loss of outlook.

Visual amenity – character of Conservation Area
The proposed rear dormer as originally submitted would have been 3.9m in width, by 1.8m in height and would have incorporated a small landing window, a pair of patio doors with Juliette balcony, and a large quantity of exterior tile hanging. The rear roof plane of the dwelling is clearly on view from Old Shoreham Road as you come south towards Ropetackle, and it was considered that the proposed rear dormer would have been contrary to the above Development Control Standard as it would have been particularly box-like and top-heavy and conspicuous. The applicant has revised the application and now the dormers are considered to be sympathetic in both their size and

design. It is not considered that they would be harmful to the appearance of the building, and that they would be a feature that would enhance the character of the Conservation Area.

The proposed rear extension would be unseen from public view. It would match the tiled roof section of the existing rear extension and would have a flat roof hidden behind. The proposed side wall would be of a rendered finish with brickwork banding details, much like the southern boundary wall of No.13. It is considered that the rear extension would be sympathetic in design to that of the dwelling and would not adversely harm the appearance or character of the Conservation Area.

Residential amenity

The proposed rear extension would align and make up the north side boundary with the attached property 'Tara' (No.13). It would project from the rear of the building at an angle, with the rearmost part being further to the north, following the existing irregular shaped site boundaries. As stated above the existing boundary between the application house and No.13 is made up of the flank wall of the existing utility room (1.5m), plus a boundary wall of 1.2m in height, and a trellis with thick growing ivy above totalling approximately 3m in height.

Whilst the proposed flank wall of the extension would be contrary to the above Development Control Guidance it is considered that as the wall would merely be replacing a similar scale of boundary treatment, and that wall itself would angle to the north lessening its impact, that the effect on the outlook would be minimal.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

2PC & 1PPi amended.
The proposed development would preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area and would not detract from the local environment and it can take place...etc. (AG1, AB4, AH7 of the ADLP)

1. C1Ci
2. C14Ai – 04.09.09 (AB4 of the ADLP)
3. C12Eii - ...and roof of the rear extension and ...etc
4. C12Ai – ...to be used for the two rear dormers has been ...etc (AB4)
5. C18Eiv – south

Case Officer: [redacted]
Date: 11-09-09 PB 14/9