Expiry Date –13/11

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1383/17 ecommendation – Refuse

Site: 6 Collingwood Court, Shoreham

Proposal: Proposed first floor front extension.

Date of site visit: 4-10-17
Neighbours checked: Y
Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application property is a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse on the south side of the road with its front elevation facing north towards Riverside. The surrounding area is an outer residential suburb of Shoreham, close to the beach.

This property is one of five pairs of semi detached houses in a staggered row. As built they have adjoining recesses at front first floor level and a separate and enclosed balcony area off the main front bedroom.

The property is not in a conservation area and is not listed.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought to infill the recessed area between the bathroom and front bedroom. The extension measures 2.9 metres in depth and is 2.5 metres wide. The existing pitched roof is to be continued down over it. It creates an en-suite bathroom.

Relevant site history

SU/266/05 – Two storey side extension. Granted 1.2.06

SU/183/05 – two storey side extension including garage with rear balcony. Refused – 18.10.05

Consultations

None

Representations

Objection on behalf of No. 7 as follows:

'No. 7 recently had to object to a proposed extension to her adjoining neighbours at No. 8 as they had applied to build at the front of their house to create an en-suite bathroom. Following the objection raised by No. 7 and Councillor Joss Loader on behalf of Shoreham Beach Residents Association, the part of the application referring to the bathroom extension was withdrawn. I quote from Cllr Loaders' comments:

'The design is out of keeping with the street scene and may lead to a terracing effect for the two semi detached properties in question.'

I have concerns that with this application there is a 'kite flying' operation going on. The proposed plan for the en-suite is identical to that which her adjacent neighbours applied for and is drawn up by the same person at the same architects. If this new application were to go through then No. 8 would re-apply successfully.

I attach a photo which I sent to the planning office before which was taken to show the style of the row of houses and interestingly this photo shows the shared drainpipe between the two properties. This of course is for those at No. 5 to deal with.'

Relevant Planning Policies

National Planning Policy Framework
Adur District Local Plan saved policies: AG1, AH7
Adur District Local Plan Submission Policies: 2, 15, 23

Planning Assessment

Principle

This application is acceptable in principle as it upgrades a dwelling in the built up area boundary. Of particular importance is character and appearance of the streetscene and impact on neighbours.

Neighbour Impact

The proposed extension adjoins the neighbours bathroom window. It will not cause significant harm to neighbour amenity.

Visual amenity

No.6 forms part of a building group which has as an original feature a first floor recess at the front. Notwithstanding narrow side extensions at Nos. 4 and 6 the character of these 10 houses and its distinctive first floor front recess is retained.

The proposed extension would remove, entirely, this characteristic recess. It would be out of character with its neighbours and would harm the appearance of the streetscene. It is contrary to saved policy AH7 (ii) which states:

Extensions and alterations to existing houses will be expected to be designed so that:-
(b) design and materials are sympathetic to both the original dwelling and the area in general.

Development Control Standard No. 3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' also states:

THE APPEARANCE

The most important basic principle is that any extension should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and street scene generally. In particular, the proposal should not be allowed to over-dominate the house or clash with its appearance.

2.6 The following principles should also help to ensure that the criteria discussed above are met:-
(a) Extensions should respect the architectural period and style of the existing dwelling and the area.

Policy 15 of the Submission Adur Local Plan 2016 states:

Development should be of a high architectural quality and respect and enhance the character of the site, and the prevailing character of the area, in terms of proportion, form, context, massing, siting, layout, density, height, size, scale, materials, detailed design features and landscaping.

This is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which states;

56. The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.

57. It is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes.

58. Planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments:

●●will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
●●establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit;
●●respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation;
●●are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

64. Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

17. Within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land-use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. These 12 principles are that planning should:
● always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings;

The proposal does not respect local character. It is contrary to local plan policy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation - REFUSE for the following reason:

The proposal by reason of its size, siting and design would appear alien and discordant and as a consequence would be harmful to the cohesive townscape and local distinctiveness. As such it is contrary to saved local plan policy AH7, Submission Local Plan policy 15, Development Control Standard No. 3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' and 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 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.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: MOK Date: 12.10.17

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 12 October 2017