Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0957/22 Recommendation: REFUSE

Site: 39 Rosemary Drive, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and construction of two storey side extension.

Date of Site Visit: 12th July 2022

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional neighbour notification: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings:

The application site is a two storey semi detached dwelling within a street of similar properties. As existing there is a front porch, side garage and rear flat roof extension which wraps around the rear of the garage. Consent is sought to remove the garage and construct a two storey side extension with the ground floor projecting forward and the first floor set down from the ridge and set back with a gable roof. Advice was given to the applicant's agent that the proposals could not be supported and instructions were given to determine the application as submitted.

Representations: - None received

Consultations:

West Sussex County Council: - The proposal may result in a loss of a parking space due to the garage conversion. The LHA does not consider that such a small shortfall may result in an unacceptable impact on the highway safety, however the LPA may wish to consider any implications on on-street parking from an amenity perspective.

The LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 111), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15

‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’’
National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

Planning Assessment

Principle

The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Visual amenity

The proposed extension will be clearly visible within the street scene as a continuation of the existing building up to the side boundary, replacing the existing garage. It will therefore give rise to a cramped form of development with no spacing between the building as extended and the neighbouring side boundary. Such a development would set a precedent for additional similar development which would result in the loss of spacing between properties therefore giving rise to a detrimental impact. Should the adjacent dwelling propose the same development the properties would abut each other altering the built form of the area significantly.

This form of development is contrary to guidance set out in Development Management Standard No. 2 which states that “Side extensions should be set back at least 1 metre from the side boundary. This is particularly important in the case of two storey extensions since, if adjacent dwellings were both extended up to the side boundary, it would create a ‘terracing’ effect which would destroy the existing character of the area.”

On the opposite side of the road there are different style properties, and there are two examples of side extensions built up to the boundary. However these are not considered to set a precedent here. These examples are adjacent to 1 metres gaps between the dwellings and these spaces would remain and would not be likely to be developed within this narrow space. Therefore the spaces will remain and the terracing effect in these cases will not occur.

Residential amenity

The adjacent property is separated from the main dwelling currently by the two side garages, the proposal would result in the building being brought closer to the side wall of the adjacent building. This is a blank elevation and therefore there would be no loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact as a result.

Recommendation

REFUSE

1. The proposed side extension, by reason of its scale, width and proximity to the boundary, would result in a closure of space between buildings which would be harmful to local character and the surrounding street scene. Moreover, if permitted, the Local Planning Authority would find it difficult to resist further similar proposals related to other dwellings in the road, the cumulative effect of which would give rise to an unacceptable 'terracing effect' that would be contrary to Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, Development Management Standard No. 2 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation N

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 27th September 2022

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 27 September 2022