Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/0245/16** **Recommendation –** Refuse

Site: 10 Querneby Close,Shoreham

Proposal: Rooms in roof with rear dormer and front rooflights and single storey extension to side and rear.

Date of site visit: 8 March 2016

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: Y 8.3.2016 42 St Julians Lane

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The site relates to an end of terrace two storey house, fronting Querneby Close. It is sited within a row of five matching terraced houses with other matching terraces to the east within Querneby Close and St Julians Lane to the east. The site lies within the Kingston Buci Conservation Area.

Permission is sought for the construction of a single storey extension to the rear, which would measure 4 metres in depth and 7.7 metres in width, and a rear dormer extension which would extend across almost the full width of the roofslope, set approximately 0.5m below the ridge line and would measure 3 metres in depth. The rear dormer would contain a window and French doors with a Juliet style balcony. As originally submitted, the proposals also included a front dormer window set above the existing bay window but this has since been deleted and three Cabrio rooflight windows would be installed within the front roofslope instead.

Relevant site history
AWDM/0143/16: Section 211 Notice under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to fell one Cypress tree in the Kingston Buci Conservation Area Permitted 11.03.2016

No.36 St Julians Lane – SU/67/03 – Rooms in roof (with rear dormer) Approved 01.07.2003

Consultations
Southern Water:- Advise the following: formal application for connection to public sewerage system required; alternative means of draining surface water required; and any sewer found during construction is to be investigated. Applicant is advised to discuss the matter further with Southern Water.

The County Archaeologist has made the following comments: *Having consulted the related documents on the Adur-Worthing planning portal and checked the West Sussex HER there are no archaeological implications arising from this proposal. There is the recorded site of a former World War II anti-aircraft battery in the vicinity but the exact location is not clear. The*

application address is within the Kingston Buci Conservation area with the grade I listed church of St Julian at its centre but there does not appear to be direct inter-visibility between the church and the application address therefore the proposals should not have an impact upon its setting.

Representations
Five representations received from the occupiers/owner of neighbouring dwellings objecting to the application proposals on the following grounds:

- Front dormer window: out of keeping with terrace/close
- Negative visual impact of front dormer/obtrusive/dominating appearance/unsympathetic
- Preference for rooflight windows
- French doors/Juliet balcony – invasive/loss of privacy
- The Conservation Area should remain unspoilt
- Rear extension is excessive in size
- Loss of light
- Harmful precedent
- Parking/access issues during construction

Relevant Planning Policies
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AB4, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising:Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012), notably para 56, 64

Planning Assessment

Residential amenity
The concerns raised by the neighbouring occupier at No.11 are noted but the proposed rear extension, although relatively large, on its east side would be positioned adjacent to the neighbour's own (more modest) extension at the adjoining dwelling at no.11 and so the full extent of the depth of the extension would not be felt. To the west it would extend beyond the line of the approved annexe extension at the rear of 42 St Julians Road and set progressively away from the side boundary on this side as the site widens towards the rear. Having regard to the relationship with neighbouring dwellings, the proposed single storey extension would not cause any significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, subject to a condition to prevent any side windows being installed in the interests of protecting privacy.

In relation to the roof alterations and extensions, given the scale of these proposals and that they relate to extensions to the roof, there would be no significant impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers as a result of the development. The comments raised in the representation are noted but views from a Juliet balcony would not be significantly greater than those from a similarly sized window.

Visual amenity
The site is at the edge of the conservation area within a row of five matching houses with other matching terraces to the east. The rear garden at No.10

backs onto Cheyne Court at the rear, a purpose built block of flats set within lawned gardens, from which views of the rear of the site are possible and from Rectory Road. Consent has been granted for the Cypress tree within the rear garden of the site to be felled. A deciduous tree in the side lawn of Cheyne Court partially obscures some of the views towards the site when in leaf but at the time of the site visit views of the rear roofslope would have been clearly visible had the Cypress been felled at this time. More distant views of the side of No.10 are also possible to the side of No.46 St Julians Lane.

The single storey rear extension is of standard design and fairly large, extending beyond the side wall of the house by 2.1 metres. However, as a single storey structure it would not be readily visible within the streetscene with fencing to the rear garden screening much of the extension from view from the north side and with the positioning of the No.10 in the corner of the cul-de-sac the extension to the side would not be visible within the streetscene.

Houses in this terrace retain the original roof form with only rooflight windows having been inserted at the opposite end of the terrace. The proposed rear dormer would significantly alter the character and appearance of the existing roofscape by introducing a large flat roof dormer window which would fail to respect the design and form of the recipient building. Its excessive size and large areas of tile hanging and relatively limited glazing area would give a top heavy and bulky appearance to the roof. There are a limited number of other examples of dormers seen in the locality, most of which are outside of the conservation area. No. 31 St Julians Lane is a similar terrace property which has a rear dormer window extension approved in 2003. This dormer is visible from the rear parking/garage compound and not readily visible to its full extent within the general streetscene and, although is itself a fairly large dormer, it is smaller, set further back up the roofslope and with less tile hanging visible than the application proposals would have. Alternative dormer designs were suggested to reduce the width and depth and to avoid excessive bulk surrounding the window frames either as one or two smaller dormers aligned above first floor windows and set further back up the roofslope. Although the applicant has deleted the front dormer originally submitted as part of the proposals in favour of rooflights to address concerns raised about its impact, the applicant has not been willing to reduce the size of the rear dormer as suggested to reduce the bulk and dominance on the rooflsope.

The National Planning Policy Framework recognises the importance of good design across all forms of development, advising in paragraph 56 that ‘The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people’, and in paragraph 64 that ‘Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.’

The proposed rear dormer would appear as an incongruous feature on the building and would be readily visible from Rectory Road. Although the proposed development would provide improved accommodation for the applicant, this would not outweigh the harm caused by poor design, impact on

visual amenity and to the character and appearance of the Kingston Buci Conservation Area.

Recommendation

Refuse for the reason:-
Having regard to the scale and design of the existing building and character of the area, the proposed dormer extension would result in an incongruous and unsympathetic form of development, giving an excessively bulky and top heavy appearance to the roof. As such the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal therefore conflicts with Saved Policies AG1, AB4, AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan 1996 and the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Informative

- 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. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to resolve those matters within the timescale allocated for the determination of this planning application. However, the Local Planning Authority has clearly set out, within its report, the steps necessary to remedy the harm identified within the reasons for refusal - which may lead to the submission of a more acceptable proposal in the future. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.
- Drawing numbers

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

Case Officer: Rebekah Smith Date: 16 June 2016

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 16 June 2016