Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0795/22 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 13 Queens Place, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Proposed single storey side infill/rear extension, rear dormer, front roof lights

Date of site visit: 26 May 2022

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a terraced house on the west side of Queens Place, within the Shoreham Conservation Area. It is proposed to construct a dormer roof extension to the rear roofslope, measuring 4m wide, 2.1m high and 3.4 deep. It will fill most of the roofslope and will be level with the ridge. It is to be finished in black slate tile, to match a similar dormer on the adjacent property to the south (No.12).

It is also proposed to install two rooflights to the front roofslope.

Finally, a ground floor flat roofed rear extension is proposed measuring 6.6m deep which will infill the current gap between an existing rear extension and the boundary with No.14 to the north.

A first floor rear extension was originally proposed but has since been removed from the application.

There are existing box dormers of a style similar to that proposed at Nos 2, 7, 8, 12 and 23, but none approved since 2015.

Relevant site history

Dormer extensions allowed at No. 7 (AWDM/0800/14) and No.12 (AWDM/1552/15).

Dormer extensions refused at No.31 Queens Place (AWDM/1188/16) and 9 Queens Place (AWDM/0491/18 and AWDM/1393/21).

Consultations

Adur &Worthing Councils: The **Environmental Health** Officer recommends a working hours condition

ADCAG: Approve

Representations

10 objections received from the occupiers of 11, 14, 15, 17 and Sunnyside Queens Place and 12 and 16 Ravens Road:

- Queens Place has a distinctive and attractive character
- Development will not preserve or enhance the Conservation Area
- Dormer will impact on light and will be overbearing
- Large and obtrusive dormer
- Loss of privacy and overlooking
- Overdevelopment
- Previous applications have been refused
- Dormer does not comply with Council's guidance
- Remaining garden will not be large enough
- Will set a precedent
- Disruption during construction due to narrow road
- Increased traffic and pressure on parking
- Inappropriate for a Victorian cottage
- Materials not in keeping
- Drainage concerns
- Increased light pollution

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 15, 17
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
Shoreham by Sea Conservation Area Character Appraisal & Management Strategy (ADC 2008)
National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity and impact on Conservation Area

The National Planning Policy Framework sets out how Government policies are applied when determining applications involving designated Heritage Assets (Conservation Areas included).

Paragraph 134 states: "*Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design*."

Paragraph 197 states:

"*In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:*
a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness."

Paragraph 202 states: "*Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.*"

Policy 17 of the Adur Local Plan states that:

"*Development in Conservation Areas will be required to be of a high standard of design and materials so as to respect, preserve and enhance the character and appearance of that area*."

The proposed dormer would physically and visually dominate the rear roof slope. While its size has been reduced slightly from that originally submitted, its basic box form and shape would appear ungainly, leaving little of the original roof still visible. Its size would be excessive, appearing out of scale with the host building. The materials to be used would not be sympathetic to the host dwelling, being black slate tiles.

Its design would be contrary to the explicit advice set out in the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance titled Development Management Standard No. 2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

At paragraph 3.11 this guidance states '*dormers should not be so large that they over-dominate the dwelling, resulting in a top heavy 'box-like' appearance … and should not project as far as the walls of the house. A large amount of the original roof should still be clearly visible*.'

The guidance goes on to state that '*where the existing roof space is of inadequate size to accommodate the room(s) proposed without adding very large flat-roof dormers, permission will not normally be granted*.'

Further, at paragraph 3.14 it is stated '*roof extensions should respect the scale, character and appearance of existing dwellings*.'

The proposal does not therefore comply with the Council's guidance which sets out the principles for achieving a design of an appropriate standard, especially in areas of particular townscape quality including Conservation Areas.

It is acknowledged that other dormers have been permitted elsewhere in the street, some relatively recently, including at Nos. 7 and 12. At the time there were considered to be sufficient reasons to grant permission. However, it has become clear that cumulatively such additions are unsightly and have a significantly detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the terrace as a whole and on the setting of the Conservation Area, views of

which are possible from the west in Ravens Road. They are obtrusive features and appear out of scale and character with the rest of the terrace. Furthermore, those permissions pre-date the current Adur Local Plan which was adopted in 2017 and which has a more stringent emphasis on design quality, as does the NPPF.

Consequently, while permission has been granted in the past for such roof extensions, it is considered that unacceptable visual harm has been caused and it would not be appropriate to grant further permissions for equally damaging roof extensions that will exacerbate the existing harm and which do not meet the quality of design expected in a Conservation Area.

The dormer therefore fails the statutory test of new development in a Conservation Area by failing to preserve its character or appearance.

The ground floor rear extension is less intrusive and will square off the existing rear of the building. It will be a large flat roofed addition but its limited visibility will minimise its visual impact and it is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The rooflights are also considered to be acceptable provided they are of a conservation style.

Residential amenity

The neighbours principally impacted upon by this development are those either side and at the rear (it is physically removed from the remainder).

There is a separation distance between the dormer and the neighbouring rear buildings of more than 50m. The dormer would be situated above eaves height and would sit alongside the existing dormer at No.12. While large and unsightly, it is not considered that it would result in adverse overbearing impact or overshadowing.

Gardens and habitable space of these neighbours already experience mutual overlooking from the first floor windows of the application property, so the severity of overlooking would not be materially worse than at present and intrusive and unacceptable loss of privacy would not result.

The rear extension will be deep at 6.6m, which is much longer than that recommended in the Council's SPG on residential extensions. It is acknowledged that there are examples of deep extensions elsewhere within Queens Place but these appear to be historic. At the depth proposed the extension will project 3.65m beyond the rear of No.14 which is to the north and which is likely to lose light and have an increased sense of enclosure as a result. That property has a restricted outlook caused by a boundary wall on which projects approximately 1m or so from the rear wall of that property. The proposed extension would project beyond that wall and worsen the outlook and light to the rear window of No.14. A reduction in the length of the extension, to finish at the end of the wall, was recommended to the applicant as this would reduce the impact on the neighbouring occupiers, but this was rejected and the application must therefore be refused.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the following reason:

1. The proposed rear dormer, by reason of its excessive size, poorly integrated basic box form and shape, and unsympathetic use of materials, would over-dominate the roof resulting in a top heavy 'box-like' appearance to the detriment of the scale, shape and form of the host dwelling and the terrace to which it belongs, and the cumulative impact of such roof extensions would fail to preserve the character or appearance of this part of the Shoreham Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 15 and 17 of the Adur Local Plan, 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'' and the relevant policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed ground floor rear extension, by reason of its size and siting, would cause unacceptable loss of natural light and outlook to No. 14 Queens Place to the detriment of occupiers' living conditions and as such is contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan and adopted Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' and the National Planning Policy Framework

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

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 14 June 2022

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 14 June 2022