Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0720/17 Recommendation – GRANT

Site: 74 - 76 High Street, Shoreham-by-Sea, BN435DB

Proposal: Listed Building Consent for installation of stud walls in kitchen to provide shower/wc for staff accommodation on first floor.

Date of site visit: 23.06.2017

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a 2 storey grade II Listed Building within the town centre of Shoreham-by-Sea. The Listing states:-

"Nos 74-76 (even) (The Queen Anne and Cuckoo Clock Restaurants) The former listing date shall be added to read: 29/9/72

SHOREHAM-BY-SEA HIGH STREET TQ 2105 SW 6/73 (north side) Nos 74-76 (even) (The Queen Anne and Cuckoo Clock Restaurants) II

Cottage pair. C17. Timber-framed; rendered to left, plastered to right, with very shallow break-back to right of centre. Brick eaves cornice to right of break-back. Slate roof with projecting stack to left and central ridge stack. Two storeys; irregular fenestration of 5 windows on first floor and 4 on ground-floor, diamond- lattice casements to left of break-back, wooden casements on first-floor over small square bays below. Two entrances in centre to left of break-back, that to left of stable-type, (No 76), that to right half-glazed, (No 74). Glazed door to right between square bays. Datestone to left on No 76 - 1706 - probably reflecting rebuilding date or whimsy.

National Grid Reference: TQ 21373 05075"

The site is also located within the Shoreham Conservation Area,

The 2no. properties, no. 74 and no. 76 are Listed together, and are still being used as one unit, which is now currently an Indian restaurant. The properties have two separate design styles with no. 76 which is to the west of no. 74 and has two frontages, one facing High Street and its west side facing West Street. From West Street it can be seen that no. 76 is a dual pitch, two storey at the front facing High Street, and then drops down into a single storey extension with a mono pitch roof at the same degree as the main room, creating a form of cat-slide roof. There is then a further single storey extension, but this time in a flat roof form, with part of the roof

being slightly raised to provide what appears to be a rooflight. This extension abuts the walkway/alley/rear access to the rear of adjoining properties in High Street. Between the mono pitch rear extension and the flat roof rear extension is a gap within which is the recessed side entrance into the restaurant.

No. 74 is also two storey, but has a valley pitch roof. The rear dual pitch roof appearing to be latter addition and has a hipped roof and is single. This rear section then runs into a flat roof rear extension, which widens and goes back to the same depth into West Street as no. 76. There is also a mono pitch single storey rear extension that fills a gap between the flat roof extension and an extension to the rear of no. 72 High Street.

The ground floor of the restaurant is thereby much larger than the first floor. The staircase to the first floor within no. 74 is narrow and steep, and leads up to small rooms currently being utilized as bedrooms.

Proposal

The proposal is seeking Listed Building Consent for the division of the existing front bedroom (east of the two), and the installation of partition walls in order to provide a kitchen and shower room.

The rooms created would measure approx. 1.55m x 1.75m for the shower room; and 3.45m x 1.8m widening to 3.45m

In order to provide water to the new kitchen and shower room there would be the need to run water pipes to both rooms, together with their associated drainage pipes. There would also be the need for the provision of electricity and or gas to the kitchen.

Relevant Planning History: Various

Consultations:

Environmental Health

The Private Sector Housing team served a Prohibition Order last year prohibiting the use of the premises, or anywhere with the curtilage of the premises, as sleeping accommodation. The Order came into effect on 6th September 2016. The Order required several works, including providing an escape route in the event of a fire, providing a kitchen and providing a bathroom with WC. The owner intends to use the rooms for staff accommodation and will be a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO).

Having looked over the plans for listed building consent, I note that the proposed kitchen and bathroom will be in the existing large rear bedroom. There is no door between the kitchen and the landing forming the escape route for the remaining bedrooms. As an FD30S fire door will be required I expect that you will need this drawn on the plans.

The small rear bedroom was formed at the time of inspection by a plasterboard stud wall i.e. not an original feature. It did not comply with the requirements for fire separation and will need to be improved as a result. Picture taken 13/07/16 enclosed for reference. Presumably this will need to be shown on the plan and form part of the application?

Adur District Conservation Advisory Group: Approve

Representations: None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan: Policy 15, Policy 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.

Proposal and Assessment

The 2no. properties has been used as a restaurant for many years, and it is clear from an internal inspection that the property is very small, and the facilities within the upstairs private areas feel smaller still as the height is gained from the roof space. Over time alterations have occurred, such as built in cupboards, but basic requirements such as washing and cooking facilities are not in place.

This application looks to provide those basic needs by dividing a bedroom into two rooms to provide a kitchen and a shower room. These additions have proved to be difficult as it was critical that the pipe work for the water into and waste out of the rooms was identified. This has now occurred.

Character of Listed Building

Whilst it is noted that it would have been unlikely that these sort of internal arrangements would have been provided originally in these properties, it is now unreasonable not to expect such facilities.

Visually, the external character of the listed building will not be compromised by the provision of these facilities, as the roof vent will be on a rear pitch and it will be of slate to marry with the existing roof. The pipe work to and from the bathroom, will utilize the existing pipework of the ground floor wc. The soil pipe will also be on a rear wall.

In any case, the pipe work are considered the norm by today's standards, so their provision will not be out of keeping with expectations of properties, even listed building properties. But in any case, care has been taken to minimize their presence.

In conclusion, it is not considered that the character of the listed building will be unduly compromised.

Recommendation Grant Consent subject to the following conditions:-

1. Approved plans
2. Standard time limit
3. Remaining part of LB to be protected
4. Damage made good
5. Reconstruction/make good with original materials

Informative:

This decision is for listed building consent for the physical works described in the application only and does not give permission for any changes of use.

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

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 25.05.2018

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 7 June 2018