

**PLANS LIST
ITEM E**

1st to 3rd Floors, 7 Waterloo Street, Hove

**BH2013/00511
Listed Building**

05 JUNE 2013

BH2013/00511 1st to 3rd Floors, 7 Waterloo Street, Hove.



Scale: 1:1,250

<u>No:</u>	BH2013/00511	<u>Ward:</u>	BRUNSWICK AND ADELAIDE
<u>App Type:</u>	Listed Building Consent		
<u>Address:</u>	First to Third Floors 7 Waterloo Street, Hove		
<u>Proposal:</u>	Removal of valley roof over rear projection, building up of surrounding walls and replacement of UPVC window with timber door, all to facilitate the creation of a roof terrace. Replacement of UPVC window with timber sliding sash window. Repair of rear chimney stack and installation of new chimney pots.		
<u>Officer:</u>	Mark Thomas Tel 292336	<u>Valid Date:</u>	14/02/2013
<u>Con Area:</u>	Brunswick Town	<u>Expiry Date:</u>	11/04/2013
<u>Listed Building Grade:</u>	Grade II		
<u>Agent:</u>	Miles Broe Architects, Coronation Studios, 104 North Road, Brighton		
<u>Applicant:</u>	Messrs De Witte Hoekzema, 7 Waterloo Street, Hove		

1 RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 11 and the policies and guidance in section 7 and resolves to **REFUSE** Listed Building Consent for the reason set out in section 11.

2 SITE LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application relates to a four storey over basement, end-of-terrace/ corner property, situated on the west side of Waterloo Street, at the junction with Lower Market Street. The property is Grade II listed, and is situated within the Brunswick Town conservation area. The property comprises stucco elevations, with timber sliding sash windows- although there are two unauthorised UPVC casement windows to the rear elevation at third floor level. The property features an 'L' shaped rear projection rising to second floor level, with a valley pitched roof over. The roof rises to the north and south over the rear projection, with the pitched roof form visible from the rear/ side of the property on Lower Market Street, in long views from the junction of Waterloo Street/ Lower Market Street and from some neighbouring properties. Whilst the valley roof form is not typical of properties within this terrace, where rear projections are visible they largely feature pitched roofs. Roof terraces to flat roofs are visible in the vicinity. There is no planning history for these terraces but, nevertheless, they are not found on listed buildings, nor have they been formed through the removal of an original pitched roof.

3 RELEVANT HISTORY

- BH2010/03599** Internal and external alterations- Approved.
BH2013/00256: Concurrent application for planning permission.

4 THE APPLICATION

- 4.1 Listed Building Consent is sought for the removal of the valley roof over the rear projection to form a roof terrace. New parapet walls would be introduced to the eastern, western and part southern elevation, extending the elevations below a further 1.4m upwards, to provide for a 1.1m high enclosure of the proposed terrace. Two unauthorised UPVC casement windows at third floor level to the rear elevation would be altered. One would be replaced with a double glazed timber sliding sash, and the other would be replaced with a double glazed timber door to access the terrace, with the cill lowered to enlarge the existing opening. Repair of the chimney stack over the rear projection is also proposed, and new pots would be installed.

5 PUBLICITY & CONSULTATIONS

External

- 5.1 **Neighbours: Twelve (12)** letters of representation have been received from **Friends of Brunswick Square and Terrace, Friends of Palmeira and Adelaide, Brunswick Place Residents Association, Lansdowne Area Residents' Association, East Brunswick Residents Association, and nos. 13a, 59, 61, 62 (flat 2) Waterloo Street and nos. 1, 7, 34 and 49 Lower Market Street** supporting the application for the following reasons:
- There are four prominent examples of roof terraces in the vicinity.
 - This design is recessed behind existing parapet walls and at high level within a narrow street- the proposal cannot be viewed from any aspect.
 - Listed status does not preclude alterations.
 - The applicants have already undertaken a high quality renovation of this listed building.
 - The terrace would provide much needed outdoor space for all ages of life.
- 5.2 **One (1)** letter of support has been received from **Councillor Sykes**. A copy of this letter is attached as an appendix to the report.

Internal:

- 5.3 **Heritage: Object** to the application for the following reasons:
- This proposal is in direct conflict with guidance in SPG BH1 and SPD 09. The alteration/ removal of the roof would harm the special architectural and historic interest of the original building by removing a historic roof structure and form. SPD 09 states that *'the original form, shape and fabric of the roof must not be altered'* and that *'consent will not be granted to remove part of a pitched roof to form a roof terrace'*. Further, SPD 09 states that *'where a roof is visible from the street, its form and shape must not be altered.'*
 - The application is therefore unacceptable in principle.
 - The proposals to remove unauthorised UPVC windows are not considered to outweigh this harm, and could anyway be enforced by the Investigations and Enforcement team.
 - The proposed window and door are nonetheless unacceptable. The proposed window is a spiral balance rather than box frame with weights. The design of the door is modern. The glazing bars on both are not traditionally detailed, but are planted on a large sheet of glass, rather than separating

smaller glazed panels. Overall these details would not give the architectural details or 3-dimensional qualities that are expected on a historic building.

- The heritage officer is aware of roof terraces in the area which have been mentioned during the course of the application. It is not considered that these have any bearing on this application, in part because none of these are on listed buildings.

6 MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that “If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.”
- 6.2 The development plan is:
- The Regional Spatial Strategy, namely The South East Plan (6 May 2009);
 - Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 (saved policies post 2007);
 - East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Plan (Adopted February 2013);
 - East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Minerals Local Plan (November 1999); Saved policies 3,4,32 and 36 – all outside of Brighton & Hove;
 - East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Waste Local Plan (February 2006); Saved Policies WLP 7 and WLP8 only – site allocations at Sackville Coalyard and Hangleton Bottom and Hollingdean Depot.
- 6.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012 and is a material consideration which applies with immediate effect.
- 6.4 Due weight should be given to relevant policies in the development plan according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.
- 6.5 The Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One (submission document) is an emerging development plan. The NPPF advises that weight may be given to relevant policies in emerging plans according to their stage of preparation, the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies and the degree of consistency of the relevant policies to the policies in the NPPF.
- 6.6 All material considerations and any policy conflicts are identified in the “Considerations and Assessment” section of the report.

7 RELEVANT POLICIES & GUIDANCE

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Brighton & Hove Local Plan:

HE1 Listed Buildings

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

SPGBH1 Roof Alterations & Extensions

Supplementary Planning Documents:
SPD09 Architectural Features

Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One (submission document)

8 CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the impact of the proposed development upon the special architectural and historic character of the listed building

Design:

- 8.2 Policy HE1 states that proposals involving the alteration or extension of a listed building will only be permitted where the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the architectural and historic character or appearance of the interior or exterior of the building or its setting, and that proposals should respect the scale, design, materials and finish of the existing building, and preserve its historic fabric.
- 8.3 Supplementary Planning Document 09 (SPD 09) states that *'the original form, shape and fabric of the roof must not be altered'* and that *'consent will not be granted to remove part of a pitched roof to form a roof terrace'*. Further, Supplementary Planning Guidance note BH1 (SPG BH1) states that a listed buildings *'historic roof structure and form should be retained'*.
- 8.4 The proposal would involve the removal of a rear valley roof, which has street value, being visible from numerous public vantage points on Waterloo Street and Upper Market Street as well as private views from neighbouring properties. The alteration/ removal of the roof would harm the special architectural and historic interest of the original building by removing a historic roof structure and form. The proposal would be contrary to the above quoted policy documents, and would be contrary to policy HE1, being harmful to the character of the listed building.
- 8.5 The in principle proposal to replace unauthorised UPVC windows does not sufficiently outweigh the harm outlined above, and could be enforced by the Planning Investigations team regardless of the outcome of the current application. Nonetheless, the proposed window and door are considered unacceptable in this context. The proposed window is a spiral balance rather than box frame with weights and the design of the door is uncharacteristically modern. The glazing bars on both are not traditionally detailed, but are planted on a large sheet of glass, rather than separating smaller glazed panels. Overall these details would not give the architectural details or 3-dimensional qualities that are expected on a historic building.
- 8.6 The proposed repair of the chimney stack and reinstatement of chimney pots is welcomed, but would only represent a modest enhancement in the context of a development of significant detriment to the historic and architectural character of the listed building.

9 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The removal of the valley roof over the rear projection would be significantly harmful to the special architectural and historic character of the listed building. The new timber window and door would represent incongruous additions which would result in similar harm. Whilst enhancement to the property would result through the proposed works to the rear chimney stack, such minor enhancement would be far outweighed by the harm which would result from the unsympathetic interventions of the wider scheme.

10 EQUALITIES

- 10.1 No issues identified.

11 REASON FOR REFUSAL / INFORMATIVES

11.1 Reason for Refusal:

- The removal of the valley roof over the rear projection would be significantly harmful to the special architectural and historic character of the listed building. The new timber window and door would represent incongruous additions which would result in similar harm. Whilst enhancement to the property would result through the proposed works to the rear chimney stack, such minor enhancement would be far outweighed by the harm which would result from the unsympathetic interventions of the wider scheme. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to policy HE1 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan, SPG BH1: Roof alterations and extensions and SPD 09: Architectural features.

11.2 Informatives:

- This decision is based on the drawings listed below:

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Proposed plans, elevations and sections	PL01	A	14 February 2013
Existing plans, elevations and sections	EX01	A	14 February 2013
Proposed door details and roof section	JD01	-	14 February 2013
Proposed window details	JD02	-	14 February 2013



PLANS LIST – 05 JUNE 2013

Brighton & Hove COUNCILLOR REPRESENTATION
City Council

Mark Thomas
Assistant Planner
Brighton and Hove City Council
Hove Town Hall

Re: BH2013 /00256 and 00511 – alterations to 7 Waterloo Street, Hove

Dear Mark

I'd like to express my support for these planning applications, submitted by a resident in my ward. I've visited the site and consider that the changes being proposed to 7 Waterloo Street are sensitive to the listed building and to the conservation area. Part of the application is in fact to restore the rear façade to original fenestration. Furthermore it appears that similar changes, but of greater scale, to neighbouring properties have been given planning permission.

I note from our draft **spd12: design guide for extensions and alterations**, that changes to the roof line on listed buildings are a critical matter; however that such changes to rear tenement roofing may be considered if there are design precedents and the changes are hidden behind a parapet wall. This seems to reflect the proposals submitted.

On a question of process, draft spd12 also strongly recommends seeking pre-application advice from Officers about any proposed changes to a listed building. I understand this was requested by the applicant or the applicant's agent but was not forthcoming, which was frustrating for the applicant. Of course this is not material with respect to the Council's decision to grant permission but it would seem reasonable and indeed prudent to help applicants avoid the high costs of full applications with detailed plans if there is significant uncertainty about approval.

With kind regards

Clr Ollie Sykes