Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0514/25 Recommendation: APPROVE

Site: 35 Rosemary Drive, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Two storey side extension with single storey addition to front elevation.

Date of Site Visit: 12th May 2025

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional neighbour notification: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a two storey semi detached dwelling within an estate of similar properties, all built with an open plan design with properties set back from the highway with verges and gardens forming the character of the locality. The dwelling is a corner plot with an open garden to the front, onto the corner with Bay Tree Close. The side of the property is onto Rosemary Drive where there is a side/ rear garden enclosed by a brick wall with grass verge adjacent to the pavement. There is vegetation to the front and side of the property but inside and outside the boundary wall. There is a detached, single garage to the rear accessed from Rosemary Drive.

Consent was originally sought to add a two storey side extension. The extension is set back from the front of the property with a single storey lean to extension to the front. The extension matches the roof form of existing. Set down from the ridge, in line with the rear of the main house. The extension will provide a kitchen, dining room at ground floor and a bedroom and ensuite at first floor. Bricks and tiles to match existing will be used.

Due to the prominent position on the corner officers considered the extension to be overly wide and the front single storey element to be out of keeping and suggestive of a separate entrance. Amended plans have been received showing a reduction in width of the extension with the two storey extension slightly deeper and a flat roof element to the front. There is a flat canopy roof extending over the front door and flat roof projection with window adjacent.

Representations: - Original Plans 1 representation has been received from the owner/occupier of 20 Rosemary Drive.

- The application states that there are no trees/hedges to be affected. It appears that there is and there is concern about any damage or removal of this greenery.
- No. 39 Rosemary Drive submitted an application for a two storey extension recently this was refused. The two schemes are similar, why would one be acceptable if another wasn't.
-

Amended Plans - no representations received

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 (December 2024)
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 extension as amended will be clearly visible within the street scene, due to the position of the dwelling on the corner of the street and the open plan design of the estate. However there is set back from the street to the front and side and the design gives rise to a subservient development with lower ridge, set back and space to the side boundary. The development complies with Development Management Standard No.2 in this case. There will be some loss of the boundary wall to the front and removal of the front hedge to allow for the extension; however the hedging inside the wall visible from the south will remain, along with the tree and the side verge which will remain unchanged. The changes to the design allow for a less prominent development and the front single storey element is cohesive, linking the new two storey extension to the host dwelling. It will appear as a single dwelling house in keeping in design with the existing residential development within the vicinity.

A representation has been received referring to the potential loss of vegetation, this has been addressed above. The open plan character of the site will remain and no harm to the visual amenity and character of the street will occur as a result of the development. The scheme is considered to be different to that at 39 Rosemary Drive referred to in the representation, where the extension was proposed to be built up to the boundary with a neighbouring dwelling and did not relate to a corner plot.

Residential amenity

The extension will be visible from neighbouring properties however due to the separation of buildings to the east, south and west there will be no loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact in this case. To the east is a blank side elevation and the new extension has no first floor windows facing south.

The representation received refers to a refused application at no. 39 Rosemary Drive, AWDM/0957/22, stating that therefore this application should not be supported. However these applications differ significantly. The refused application sought permission for a two storey extension adjacent to a neighbouring dwelling. This therefore created a terracing effect, enclosing the gap at first floor between the buildings. This development was contrary to Development Management Standard No. 2 and harmful to the street scene. The reason for refusal is copied below: -
“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.”

The current application is adjacent to the highway, no terracing effect will occur and as set out above the development complies with DMS No.2 and no harm will occur to the street scene or residential amenity in this case.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials to match existing
4. The existing boundary wall shall be protected and maintained for the duration of the works and shall remain in place, in accordance with the approved plans.
5. No additional openings on the southern elevation.
6. Ancillary only

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation Y

1. Proactive with amendments.

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 24th June 2025

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 26 June 2025