Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1428/17 Recommendation – GRANT

Site: 1 Old Swan Cottages, Church Street, Shoreham-by-Sea, BN43 5DT

Proposal: Listed Building Consent for single storey extension to north elevation

Date of site visit: 09.08.2017

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a 3 storey grade II Listed Building within the town centre of Shoreham-by-Sea. The Listing states:-

"SHOREHAM-BY-SEA CHURCH STREET (west side) Nos 1 and 2 (Old Swan Cottages)

(Formerly listed as Old Swan House) GV II House. Mid C18 with C19 extension to left. Incised plaster Red brick eaves cornice to plain tiled mansard roof with gable-parapets and end stack. Two C20 flat-headed dormers. Two storeys and attic; slightly irregular 3 window front, sashes, except first floor window in left-wing, wooden casement. Glazed door to right of left-wing, doorway with non-opening glazing to right of centre on right-hand block. One storey lean-to extension to left. Two-storey wing to rear with combination half-hipped, hipped mansard roof.

Listing NGR: TQ2154805130"

The site is located within the Medieval Core of Shoreham and is within the Shoreham Conservation Area. The Church of St Mary De Haura a Grade I Listed Building, and grounds are opposite the application site to the east. An Article 4 Direction was made in 1996 relating to properties in Church Street, Shoreham, which removed their permitted development rights.

No. 1 is on a corner site and has an 'L' shaped plot. The dwelling is a 3 storey mansard roof dwelling and has 2no. flat roof dormers in its front elevation. The front and side elevation are painted white and appears to be scored Roman render to appear as blockwork, the rear elevation is faced in unpainted brick and flint sections.

The front elevation faces sideways to the street onto a 'link' road between Church Street to the east and Middle Street to the west. No. 2 Old Swan Cottages appears to have been a side extension to the main house, namely the application site, but is

now is a separate dwelling unit. The rear garden to the house runs to the north and then turns to run to the west, thereby forming the 'L' shaped plot.

The house also has a single storey flat roof rear extension that directly abuts Church Street. This extension has parapet sides to the road and to the north, which hide the flat roof from view. The parapet does not continue on the inside edge, and instead there is a set of metal railings with finials.

The outside elevation of the extension directly abuts the road, and adjoins close board fencing and gate, the fencing being over a low wall followed by a further white painted wall.

Proposal

The proposal is seeking Listed Building Consent for:-

1. the partial demolition of the single storey parapeted later extension, including the removal of the felted flat roof. (The outside wall of the extension that serves also as the boundary wall directly abutting Church Street, will remain);
2. The construction of a larger extension also single storey utilizing the outside wall. The erection will be the same length as existing but the rear section will be slightly wider, by approx. 1.1m;
3. The height of the replacement building will be approx. 100mm lower than the existing height;
4. Provide an opening through the internal wall between the kitchen and the dining room;
5. A further single storey extension to the rear of the existing rear entrance hall, measuring approx. 3m wide x 1.9m deep x approx. 2.9m high, which will adjoin the main extension being applied for.
6. Each of the extended sections would have a plateau roof light

Relevant Planning History:

SU/25/85/TP/2363 Application for Listed Building Consent for single storey extension (wc and lobby) **Granted Consent 02.04.1985**

AWDM/1696/17 Alterations to width of garage door opening and installation of new automated sectional door. **Approved 15.12.2017**

Consultations:

WSCC Archaeologist

"No 1 Old Swan Cottages is listed grade II and described in the listing details as house, mid-18th century with 19th century extension to the left (presumably No 2 Old Swan Cottages). It has rendered elevations to the south and east but flint walling is visible to the rear elevation. The core of the house may be older than the 18th century date ascribed in the listing.

The house is situated to the west of the churchyard of St Mary de Haura (i.e. 'of the port' as in 'Le Havre') which contains the ruined remains of the nave of the church. It is within the Conservation Area of New Shoreham. The buildings on Church Street form part of the setting of the Grade I church but are reasonably well screened by the churchyard trees.

The size and scale of the proposed new extension is very modest and can be taken as a de minimis matter which does not require archaeological monitoring and recording.

Nevertheless, in considering these proposals and the suggested design of the new extension I feel that there is scope to revisit the design concept and fulfil the aims of The NPPF paragraphs 126, 131 and 137 in terms of enhancing the significance of the designated heritage asset. The rear, north facing elevation of 1, Old Swan Cottages is a disjointed mixture of building materials and fenestration. It has an ugly two storey staircase tower with mansard roof, sitting centrally in the rear elevation, which appears to be a late 20th century addition. Looking at large scale Ordnance Survey maps, the staircase tower is not on the editions of the 1950s but is shown on the 1974 1:1250 edition. The fact that there is no window in the staircase tower draws attention to its bulk and ugliness. At ground level, to the right of the staircase tower is a multi-paned sash window (which may be an original survivor). Above it is a plain two light casement window and in the top right hand corner a square blocked opening which may have been an early window also. This area is the only part of the house where the original flint walling is visible but presumably it would have carried across the whole width of the rear (north facing) elevation (and is likely to have been the treatment used on the front elevation.

The Design and Access (D&A) Statement explains the concept of the proposed new extension with the glazed and metal framed design aiming to mark a distinct contrast with the older listed structure. Unfortunately, because of the bulk of the staircase tower I am not convinced that the new work will be on a sufficiently grand and eye catching scale to achieve this. The D&A statement also makes clear that the intention of the proposal is not to extend beyond the northern footprint of the existing single storey flat roofed extension. I think this is a mistake and that the extension should be carried further northwards to the timber side gate. In turn, this could allow the main ground floor reception area of the listed building to be restored to its original dimensions by pushing the kitchen and breakfast/ dining area further northwards and re-instating the line of the original rear wall which, from the plan of the ground floor, has clearly been demolished to extend the kitchen into this living space. This would create a more flexible reception or dining space at the eastern end of the main room and re-establish the original architectural proportions while still allowing the same amount of space for the proposed kitchen/ breakfast area. If, instead of the modernist glass and black metal frame box extension the design aimed for the look of an 'orangery' with a larger, pitched skylight extending the full length of the kitchen breakfast room and multi-paned, timber framed doors and windows opening onto the

garden this should achieve the desired amount of daylight and functionality while creating a design more in keeping with the age of the building. Ideally, in addition, a window at first floor level in the staircase tower to balance the rear entrance door to the utility/ WC area would help resolve the present discordant appearance of the rear. Such a scheme would require a modest northward extension of the rendered wall and parapet fronting onto Church Street but I consider that the impact on the setting of the church and churchyard would be negligible."

Councils Conservation Architect: No issues with the Crittall details

Representations: None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017: Policy 15, 16, 17
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Listed Building Assessment

The NPPF states that when considering the impact of proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

Listed Building Character

The Listed Building frontage is onto a drive-like road running at approx. 90° from the named roads, Church Street and Middle Road. Its high mansard roof making a statement in the street which generally contains development with hipped and gable pitch roofs. The mansard appears to have clay plain tiles on the lower pitch and pan tiles on the upper pitch of the roof. The rear has coursed flintwork and some facing bricks. It also has a later addition two storey mansard roof which covers the internal staircase addition to the original dwellings. The front and side elevation appears to be Roman render, and is scored to create the look of blockwork. The unusual dwelling makes a statement in the Conservation Area, and its side facing adds to its charm.

Proposal Assessment

The proposed rebuild of the existing extension together with its enlargement, will not be readily viewed outside of the site and the existing parapet will remain. The

extension will link up in a more assimilated manner with the existing bits and pieces of rear extensions etc. that are currently in place, and will provide a more usable internal accommodation.

There is a proposed roof overhang at the rear of the extension, and in order for it not to be readily viewed from outside of the site, part of the existing rear parapet roof will be retained next to the road, and the overhang will be set away from the boundary.

The provision of plateau rooflights within the roof area, will be acceptable as they will not significantly protrude above the roof. The use of the Conservation rooflight will be used over the Kitchen section, and the Neo rooflight will be used over the Entrance sections of the extension.

The comments and suggestions from the County Archaeologist are noted, but the applicants are not looking for a larger, more expensive form of development, and purely are seeking to create a more workable kitchen area and separated wc., together with views from the living area into the garden. The increase in footprint will only be approx..8.5 sq.m.

It is considered that the proposal will not harm the integrity or the setting of the Listed Building and because of its low height will not be readily viewed from the Conservation Area, and thereby has a neutral effect on it.

Recommendation – Grant Consent subject to conditions

1. Approved plans
2. LBC Standard time limit
3. Materials to be in white washed render to match the existing wall
4. No damage to LB
5. Any damage to be made good
6. Original materials for making good

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 19.12.2017

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 19 December 2017