Expiry Date - 11-10-2016

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/1188/16**

Recommendation – REFUSE

Site: **31 Queens Place Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex**

Proposal: **Rear dormer**

Neighbours checked: Y
Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a flat roof rear dormer to measure (at max) 2.2 metres in height, 2.7 metres in length, and 4.3 metres in width.

The application property is mid terrace dwellinghouse, two-storey. Pedestrian access exists to the rear.

The site is situated in an inner residential neighbourhood of Shoreham, within the Shoreham Conservation Area (Character Area Residential Areas (north)).

Relevant Planning History

None

Consultations

Southern Water: *No objection*

Representations

None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework
Saved Adur Local Plan policies: AG1, AB4, AH7
SPG titled Development Control Standard No. 3 *'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'*.
Adur Local Plan 2016 (Submission) Policies: 2, 15, 17

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle, subject to satisfying the statutory test for new development in a Conservation Area.

Visual amenity and Heritage Assets

The National Planning Policy Framework sets out how Government policies are applied when determining applications involving designated Heritage Asserts (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"*

The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance Appraisal for the Shoreham Conservation Area makes reference to Queens Place within the character area named "*Residential Areas North of the Historic Core"*.

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.

Its design would be contrary to the explicit advice set out in the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance titled Development Control Standard No. 3 *'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 stating at paragraph 3.12 *'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 noted that other dormers have been permitted elsewhere in the street, some quite recently. However these are located on the rear of terraces in which the form and shape of the roof profile has already been compromised, by dormers already in existence and are predominantly at the rear of the terrace on the opposite side of the street. In contrast, the roof profile, form and shape at the

north end of the terrace to which No. 31 belongs, is largely unaltered with its original historic profile intact - so making a greater positive contribution to the street scene than the rear of the terrace directly opposite, on the west side.

Additionally, due to the more open aspect of the garage compound serving Stockwell House to the north, the rear of No. 31 is more visible than those other dormers, so the impact of the current proposal on the intrinsic character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be more substantial than those permitted dormers.

In summary, the proposal is of a poor design standard failing 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.

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 separation distance between the dormer and the neighbouring rear buildings. The dormer would be situated above eaves height and neither of the neighbouring buildings to the north and south have roof lights in their respective rear roof slopes. Consequently, adverse overbearing and overshadowing would not result.

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 be made no worse than at present - intrusive and unacceptable loss of privacy would not result.

These impacts would satisfy the standards set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Development Control Standard No. 3.

Recommendation

REFUSE

The applicant, via their planning agent, was made aware of the Council's concerns on the design standard of the scheme prior to a decision being issued. Opportunity was given to reduce the size of the dormer. However the agent confirmed that their client was unwilling to do so. The application is duly refused.

For the following reason:

The proposed rear dormer would, by reason of its excessive size and poorly integrated basic box form and shape, 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, in consequence, fail to preserve the character or appearance of this part of the Shoreham Conservation Area. This is contrary to Saved

Local Plan policies AB4 and AH7 and allied Supplementary Planning Guidance titled Development Control Standard No. 3 *'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'*, and emerging Adur Local Plan 2016 (submission) Policies 15 and 17, as well as those relevant policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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. 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? N/A

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 24-10-2016

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 24 October 2016