Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0491/18 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 9 Queens Place, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Proposed rear dormer to west elevation.

Date of site visit: 3 May 2018

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 4.8m wide, 2.1m high and 3.4m deep. It will fill most of the roofslope and will be level with the ridge. It is to be finished in slate grey artificial slate.

There are existing box dormers of a similar style at Nos 2, 7, 8, 12 and 23.

Relevant site history

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

Dormer extension refused at No.31 Queens Place (AWDM/1188/16)

Consultations

None

Representations

7 letters of objection received from the occupiers of 11, 13, 14 Queens Place, 6, 12, 14, 16 Ravens Road:

- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- Loss of light
- Existing roof extensions in Queens Place are unattractive and detract from character and appearance of the Conservation Area
- Dormers dominate the roofs of these small houses
- Inappropriate materials
- Rooflights would be more appropriate to the area
- Damage has already been done but not a reason to allow further damaging extensions
- Roof extensions increase size of the houses and lead to more people and greater parking problems

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 15, 17
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

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).

Account should be taken of the desirability for sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and the desirability of new development to make a positive contribution to character and distinctiveness (para. 131). This reflects the statutory test set out in primary legislation.

Paragraph 133 states "where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to … a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent"

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. 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 window in the dormer would not be of a similar style or proportion to the original dwelling. The materials to be used would not be sympathetic to the host dwelling or the area.

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 quite 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.

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.

The current proposal is of a poor design standard which fails to successfully integrate itself to the host dwelling and the terrace to which it belongs and, in consequence, fails the statutory test of new development in a Conservation Area by failing to preserve its character or appearance. Permission should be refused.

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.8. 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.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the following reason:

The proposed rear dormer, by reason of its excessive size and poorly integrated basic box form and shape, 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.

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. The Local Planning Authority is willing to meet with the Applicant to discuss the best course of action and is also willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 25 May 2018

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 25 May 2018