Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0162/13 and AWDM/0166/13 **Recommendation**
Site: 4 The Street, Shoreham **Refuse**

Proposal: - First floor extension above existing single storey extension (LBC and Planning permission)

Date of site visit: 18th February 2013

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is an early 18th Century Grade II Listed semi-detached cottage on the south side of The Street, within the Old Shoreham Conservation Area. It forms part of a group listing with the adjoining dwelling, No. 5. The Street curves down on a south-west axis with a high flint wall situated directly north of the application property, fronting the adjacent dwelling (Southern Cross). Nos 4 and 5 The Street are set back from the road and lie slightly below street level behind a flint wall. To the rear, there is a courtyard and a raised lawned area (above street level).

The List Description states:

Nos 4 and 5 (incl) II Cottage Row, now cottage pair. Early C18, extended to right in later C18. Flint with some cobblestone to right. Red brick dressings and quoins. Plain tiled roof hipped to left with end brick stacks and 3 irregularly-placed semi-dormers with sloping roofs. One and a half storeys; 3 windows, irregular with further small window at higher level to left of centre. Mixture of fixed windows and casements with sliding casements on ground floor to left and in all dormers. Entrances to left (No 4) and in centre and at right (both no 5). Weather boarded section at entrance left with full-width strip window under eaves.

No.4 has been altered internally and externally, most significantly with a single storey rear/side addition located at the east (permitted 1999) and a double rear roof dormer.

The adjoining cottage (No.5) was extended in the mid 1990's with a single storey hipped roof rear extension and rebuilding of the rear catslide roof. This extension is visible from The Street from which, although attached, it reads as a separate

outbuilding with a link to the parent building which is not visible in the street scene.

The applications seek consent for a first floor addition above the existing single storey extension to provide additional living accommodation (a bedroom and small store room). The overall gain in floorspace would be approximately 10 sqm. The height of the existing extension would increase by 0.95m, with a raised hipped roof and two conservation rooflights (south and west).

Relevant site history

There is extensive planning history as follows:

1928 – Additions (1167)

1965 – W.C (10/65)

1986 – LBC consent for rear dormer (bathroom and enlarged bedroom) and new rear entrance door. Refused (144/84/TP)

1986 – LBC for modernisation of existing cottage by the addition of a dormer window at rear, porch at side, new windows at rear and widened front door. Permitted. (SU/56/86/TP/LB)

1986 – LBC for alterations and removal of part of flint wall to form vehicular access. Permitted (SU/74/86/TP/LB)

1993 – LBC Infilling of door and wooden boarded section on front elevation with flint faced wall. Permitted (SU/65//93/TP/15157)

1999- LBC and planning permission for single storey rear/side extension and additional door at front (SU/68/99/TP/LB)

2003 – LBC reconstruction of rear dormer and side addition roofs and chimney (SU/13/03/TP).

Consultations:

CAAC: - Unanimously approved.

Conservation Architect: Discussed with Case Officer and supports recommendation for refusal.

Representations:

None

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan (1996) Saved Policies, AB3, AB4, AB6 AB7, AB8, AB9, AG1, AH7
SPG 'Extending or altering your home';
Internal Space Standards for New Homes Good Practice Guide (Adur District Council)
The National Planning Policy Framework

Planning Assessment

The NPPF states that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of a heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.

It states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected to understand the potential impact of the proposal. LPA's should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset, taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. This assessment should be taken into account to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

The special interest of 4 The Street is based on the retention of its overall form as one half of a pair of early 18th Century cottages. Being set below street level and of a linear form, they strongly benefit the visual appearance of the street scene. The cottages are amongst relatively few surviving historic buildings in Old Shoreham, clustered around St Nicholas Church and the Old Farm and extending up The Street (which was the historic route to Beeding). It is likely the building was developed as a farm workers cottage. The applicant's Heritage Statement and the list description concur that Nos 4 and 5 were originally one cottage, extended on either side in the late 18th C to form two cottages.

Both properties have evolved over a number of years by way of internal alterations and external additions. However, it is considered that they retain architectural integrity and the appearance, scale and proportions of small cottages, particularly in terms of the front elevation.

It is accepted that the proposed extension would not physically impact on historic fabric as it would be attached to a modern extension. It is also noted that the applicant has reduced the size and bulk of the proposed extension, as originally proposed at pre-application stage. However, given the size of the cottage and plot, any further additions capable of creating meaningful floorspace (i.e.

providing additional living space/rooms) would have a detrimental impact on the overall proportions of the building and its adjoining neighbour.

The existing side/rear extension appears subservient to the parent building. Whilst visible in the public realm, it does not have an undue impact in terms of its relationship with the host building and the Conservation Area. Similarly, the extension at the rear of No.5 The Street is also subservient visually, being a single storey addition linked to the parent building.

The fact that the cottages are set lower the street level and screened in part by a high flint wall extenuates their small scale and to some degree moderates the visual impact of the existing side/rear extensions.

The existing side/rear extension was designed to incorporate a physical 'break' between the proposed roof and the rear of the original building. The eaves of the existing extension align approximately with that of the host building and the ridge height when viewed from the front is well below that of the main roof. The proposed extension would raise the height of the roof and when viewed from the frontage it would align over two thirds of the way towards the apex.

The development of an additional floor to the side/rear extension of No.4 The Street would create vertical emphasis, thus altering the proportions which would appear at odds with and compete visually with the host building. Furthermore, the visual impact of a discordant addition would have a detrimental impact on the street scene and the Old Shoreham Conservation Area. As such, the proposal is deemed to represent undue harm to the significance of statutory heritage assets, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework. The small amount of floorspace which would be achieved as a result of the proposal is not justified when balanced against the impact of the proposal on the heritage assets.

Furthermore, the floorspace of the proposed living accommodation would be inadequate. The double bedroom would 8.5 sq m with a width of 2.2m. The minimum size required for a double bedroom is 12 sqm with a width of 2.6m. As such, the proposal would not meet the Council's minimum residential space standards.

Impact on residential amenity

There is sufficient distance between the proposed extension and adjoining properties.

Recommendation

Listed Building Consent:

REFUSE for the reason: -

1. The Grade II listed building is component of a pair of cottages of linear form that strongly benefit the street scene and the character of the Old Shoreham Conservation Area. The proposed extension would clearly be seen from The Street, particularly on the approach from the north. The proposal by virtue of its design, location and scale would be detrimental to the historic appearance and layout of the listed buildings and the character of the Conservation Area. It would not therefore comply with saved policies AG1, AB3, AB4, AB6 AB7, AB8, AB9 of the Adur District Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Planning Permission:

REFUSE for the reason: -

1. The Grade II listed building is component of a pair of cottages of linear form that strongly benefit the street scene and the character of the Old Shoreham Conservation Area. The proposed extension would clearly be seen from The Street, particularly on the approach from the north. The proposal by virtue of its design, location and scale would be detrimental to the historic appearance and layout of the listed buildings and the character of the Conservation Area. It would not therefore comply with saved policies AG1, AB3, AB4, AB6 AB7, AB8, AB9 of the Adur District Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? Yes

Case Officer signed: Joanne Sanderson Date: 3rd May 2013

Authorised and signed by: Jo Morin Date: 7 May 2013