Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0915/23 Recommendation: Approve

Site: 25 Church Street, Shoreham-by-sea

Proposal: Construction of single-storey rear extension following the removal of existing conservatory. Relocation of downpipe.
Lowering of ground floor (kitchen only) and reinstatement of partition wall.

Date of Site Visit: 26 July 2023

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional neighbour notification: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings:

The application relates to a Grade II listed building in the Shoreham Conservation Area, between Church Street and Middle Street. There is an existing rear conservatory which it is proposed to remove and replace with a new single storey extension, of deliberately contemporary appearance. Internal and external alterations are also proposed, including the relocation of a downpipe.

As amended, the extension measures 4.3m deep, with an additional roof overhang taking it to 5.2m. It has large areas of glazing, concrete walls and a flat, zinc roof. The flat roof will help to keep the roof height low, thereby not obscuring the upper floor of the house. There is a small area of glazed roof which provides a link between the extension and the house and which, according to the Design, Access and Heritage Statement, “will visually detach the extension from the host building preserving the legibility of its original form.” A utility and shower room is to be provided at the southern end of the extension, stepped back and with no roof overhang, to break up the elevation. A section of wall is to be removed in order to gain access from the house.

Access to the new extension from the existing kitchen will be via a new doorway opening created by enlarging the existing doorway.

The kitchen floor is also to be lowered and an original partition wall is to be reinstated.

A separate listed building application has also been submitted (AWDM/0916/23).

Planning History: Various applications

Consultations:

Adur and Worthing Councils: The **Design and Conservation Architect:**
Comments on original plans: The design & access statement incorporating heritage statement is well researched and shows an understanding of this building's significance. The loss of the current modern conservatory would not be an issue, although the loss of the downpipes which appear to currently drain the 19th century roof, leave a question regarding how this area would subsequently be drained. The concept behind the general form of the proposed extension is also clearly explained, including the contemporary palette of materials. I would support this approach where the extension can clearly be read as a later addition.
The proposed footprint and associated volume of the proposed extension does give me some cause for concern. Currently the rear of the listed building has a fairly intimate, domestic scale to its varied features. The proposal is likely to become the dominant feature to this aspect of the building. The heritage statement has remained silent on this particular impact.
The change to the kitchen floor height, the reblocking up of the internal wall and the removal of the ubiquitous, Victorian brickwork, are all supportable in principle subject to further details.

Comments on amended plans: No objection

Trees and Landscape Officer: I do not consider the trees near the building to have a significant enough public view to be considered for a TPO. As this is part of a development / extension I do not think they need to make a separate application - It is not needed for TPO trees. However if a separate application were made for any reason to fell and replace I would recommend approval.

I do consider the Macrocarpa at the rear worth retaining - would an RPA be needed for it?

Representations

Objection to original plans received on behalf of the occupier of 23 Church Street:

1. The extension is of excessive size in relation to the original Listed Building.

2. The plans appear to show construction immediately adjacent to a 3 metre high listed flint wall. I understand that whilst in theory there could be some protection to me under the Party Wall etc Act 1996, the wall is of such a size and position that any resulting damage could not effectively be rectified in the correct manner.

This wall is also unlikely to have more than minimal foundations which could clearly become unstable in construction of the new building and fall onto my building, 23 Church Street.

3. The application form is incorrect stating that no trees will need to be removed for the proposal. It is evident that there is at least one tree which will need to be removed and I suspect there are several other trees on the site which will be affected. It is my understanding that these trees being within the curtilage of a Listed Building therefore have Tree Preservation Orders.

4. Although I have seen from the Design and Access Statement suggestions that the design has been used on properties elsewhere, this seems inappropriate for an extension on a Listed building of this type.

5. The use of cast in place concrete board marked would seem totally inappropriate for a Listed Building. Also in the event that this needed to be removed in future, considerable extra damage would be caused during its dismantling.

6. It would appear from the plans that they are effectively trying to use the listed flint boundary wall as part of the structure of the new extension. Any alterations to this wall could cause problems, given the lack of foundations as mentioned before. Even adding insulation or the like to the wall would affect its character and thus not be appropriate.

7. I am concerned that lowering the kitchen floor could have an adverse effect on my property, although clearly this could take some time to occur.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 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 relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the historic character and appearance of the listed building and conservation area.

Visual amenity and impact on character of Conservation Area and Listed Building

The extension has a contemporary form and appearance and, as originally proposed, was considered to be too large and dominant. Amended plans have been received reducing the depth of the extension from 5.5m to 4.3m and this is considered to be more acceptable.

It is a lightweight and contemporary addition which does not compete with the host building and which is considered to preserve the historic character and fabric of the listed building. It will not be visible from Church Street or readily visible from Middle Street and will preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

While an objection has been received in respect of the form, design and use of materials, the Council's Design and Conservation Architect considers it to be an acceptable proposal.

Residential amenity

The occupier of the attached house to the south, No. 23, has objected to the proposal and is concerned about the impact of the proposal on the boundary flint wall. The architect has responded by stating:

"The extension will be designed in such a way that there is no need for foundations to be dug close to the flint wall. We have significant experience of building extensions in similar circumstances where we would look to construct a footing parallel to but some distance away from the flint wall.

The slab would then be cantilevered from this footing so there is minimal excavation needed around the base of the wall. Insulation etc can be accommodated by a wall stood off the flint wall so there will be little if any impact on the wall.

These matters can be adequately addressed via a party wall agreement."

The wall is not visible to the public and the extension will obstruct only a short section of it. With the assurance about construction as set out above, plus the Party Wall Agreement, it is not considered that the proposal will have an adverse impact on the wall or the neighbouring occupier.

Trees

The trees to be removed are not significant and do not have public amenity value. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer does not consider them to be worthy of formal protection.

A large Macrocarpa at the rear is sufficiently distant to not be affected by the proposal.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials as specified

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation Y

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 19 September 2023

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 19 September 2023