

APPENDIX – STATEMENT – SHAFTESBURY Plc

Matter 8 – Design and Heritage

Policy 41 – Townscape and Architecture

Q.5 Is Policy 41 justified and consistent with national policy, particularly with regard to storey limitations, upwards extensions and density? Is it clear when each of the criteria in Policy 41 would be applicable? Particularly, is predominantly residential area clearly defined? Are the proposed modifications necessary for soundness?

Yes, Policy 41 is considered to be consistent with Policy 118e of the NPPF which supports opportunities to use the airspace above existing residential and commercial for new homes.

However, it is not considered clear where the policy is applicable. A large part of the West End has residential uses on the upper floors but is mixed-use in character.

Shaftesbury supports the principle of this policy which sensitively seeks to balance growth with the existing, particularly historic, environment. The amendment to the policy which acknowledges that extensions to residential extensions could be either to enlarge existing accommodation or provide new homes is welcomed. However, it is not particularly clear why commercial extensions may be appropriate for one or more storey extensions, but residential only one. The amended Policy 41F in the submission version of the plan states that

F On residential buildings or in predominantly residential areas an additional roof storey will be permitted supported in principle where this adds new residential floorspace to an existing unit or creates a new self-contained residential unit and meets one of the following criteria in Part E.

Residential buildings are found across the City including within the West End, and such little support for larger extensions may result in developers lacking the confidence to otherwise bring forward development which would provide much needed new homes.

Paragraph 41.7 acknowledges the following –

‘Works to alter and extend existing buildings will be supported where they are successfully integrated with their surroundings. To achieve this, extensions should be subordinate to the host building, respecting the scale, detailing and materials of both existing buildings and adjoining townscape. Care should always be taken not to disfigure buildings or upset their proportions.’

Given the key test of the policy is whether the extension suits the host building and townscape it is not clear why the land use should also be a factor. References to the land uses within the policy could be removed and the policy simplified in this regard.

Similarly, we do not consider that Part F of the policy should be retained on the basis that the assessment should be on whether an upward extension is appropriate to the host building and townscape; the land use and strategic designations are irrelevant from this perspective and the CAZ needs to be able to deliver additional accommodation to meet the aspiration of the Plan.