Expiry: 22/7

Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0647/25 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 4 Tottington Way, Shoreham

Proposal: Retention of 20ft storage container to front of property to allow safe storage of tools, bikes etc. Hedge side of container to be painted dark green with remaining three elevations clad using treated timber in a vertical hit and miss style.

Date of site visit: 30/5

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a detached bungalow on the east side of Tottington Way close to the junction with Slonk Hill Road in north Shoreham.

The site is not in a conservation area and is not a listed building. There are no TPO's on the site and no known flood risk.

Permission is sought to retain a blue metal shipping container in the front garden. The container sits at an angle to the road and bungalow. There is a high hedge on part of the front garden frontage but the container is clearly visible from the road and from neighbouring properties, particularly No. 2.

From Google street view it appears to have been in situ for at least 2 years. The applicant would like to paint the west side (hedge side) green and to timber clad the 3 other sides.

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/0695/25 - Raised patio area with steps leading to garden. Construction of privacy screen to Southern boundary, fencing with trellis on Northern boundary. Pending

AWDM/0343/20 - Proposed front/side extension and proposed rear/side extension (garage removed). Granted

Consultations

None.

Representations

4 objections, including from Nos. 2 and 6 summarised as:

Expiry: 22/7

Out of character for a front garden in a residential area.
Bad precedent
Overdevelopment
Creates a poor outlook from No. 2
Container and front garden used for builders business storage for last 2 years.
In extending the bungalow the applicant removed their own garage and thus their storage opportunity.
They could have bike storage etc. in a shed in their 80 foot rear garden.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and 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 proposal involves upgrading the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Policy 15: Quality of the Built Environment and Public Realm

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. Development should:
• Enhance the local environment by way of its appearance and character, with particular attention being paid to the architectural form, height, materials, density, scale, orientation, landscaping and layout of the development;
• Make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area; and not have an unacceptable impact on adjacent properties, particularly residential dwellings, including unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, outlook or open amenity space;

When considering applications for extensions or alterations to dwellings, proposals will be expected to comply with the criteria contained in the Council's adopted Development Management Standard No.2 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" (as amended or superseded by other Council guidance in force at the time an application is considered) or any other appropriate national standard.

Adopted Development Management Standard No.2 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings"

Expiry: 22/7

The effect on neighbouring properties
2.2 Proposals will not be granted planning permission if they have an unacceptably adverse effect on neighbouring properties. The main detrimental effects could be related to:

• Outlook – the fact that a neighbour may be able to see an extension would not in itself make a proposal unacceptable, the outlook of neighbouring properties should not be dominated by the extension since this could be overbearing and oppressive. However, the loss of a distant view would not normally be considered a valid reason for refusing an application

The appearance

2.5 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 the street scene generally. An extension which is acceptable in a low density modern development may not be acceptable in a town centre location. In particular, the proposal should not be allowed to over-dominate the house or clash with its appearance.

Front extensions, porches and canopies

3.16 Front extensions are particularly difficult to incorporate successfully with the existing house and streetscene. They should not usually extend significantly beyond the "building line", or abut side boundaries. For this reason, front extensions on terraced properties (other than small porches) will not usually be allowed. In the case of semi-detached or detached dwellings, front extensions will only be allowed where the extension can be successfully assimilated into the streetscene and not unduly affect neighbours.

Residential amenity

No. 4 is on higher ground than No. 2. The storage container is large. It is intrusive and unsightly from No. 2's perspective and results in unsightly outlook for residents at No. 2. It is also visible from No.6 but to a lesser extent. Nonetheless it is untypical of a front garden situation and untypical of what a neighbour would expect to see out of their front window.

Visual amenity

The container is clearly visible in the street and from neighbouring properties. It is not domestic in scale or character and dominates the front garden. It does not enhance local distinctiveness nor the appearance of the streetscene. It is harmful to visual amenity. Changing its appearance by painting and cladding it would not significantly improve the appearance or disguise its scale in this front garden setting.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the following reason:

Expiry: 22/7

The size, scale, location and appearance of this shipping container is out of character with this domestic front garden and harmful to the appearance of this residential streetscene and to neighbouring outlook. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan and adopted Development Management Standard No.2 “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings”

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

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 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.

Case Officer:	MOK	Date: 8/7/25
Authorised by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 8 July 2025