Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0889/22 Recommendation – REFUSE

Site: 27 Downside, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Raising and extension of roof to form part gable to front and rear with rear balcony, single storey front and rear extensions. Light grey Cedral cladding to be used for front and rear gables (revised resubmission of approved AWDM/2154/21)

Date of site visit: Visited when considering AWDM/2154/21

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a hipped roof detached bungalow within a street which is dominated by properties which originally were constructed with this design. With hipped roofs, front projection, a front garden, driveway and entrance to the side. Many properties still retain this character whilst others have been extended and remodelled with raised ridge heights, front and rear gable extensions, side dormers and rear extensions visible in the street scene. Variation has been gradually introduced and a mixture of property styles currently exists. Examples of recent ridge height increases are nos. 4 (AWDM/1864/21), 11,(AWDM/1981/20) 17, (AWDM/1105/19), 25, (AWDM/2091/21)

Consent was granted under AWDM/2154/21 for a raised ridge in keeping with the character of the former consents, front and rear gable extensions, a single storey flat roof extension to the rear and extension to the front. A rear Juliet balcony was also permitted with light grey cedral cladding to the front and rear gable. The current application seeks to amend the existing consent proposing a balcony above the flat roof extension to be accessed from the first floor with the Juliet balcony replaced with outward opening doors.

Representations

None 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 (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 balcony would not be clearly visible within the street scene being to the rear of the property, yet it would be visible from neighbouring properties and would result in a form of development which is not commonplace within this locality. The applicant's agent has made reference to a rear balcony with balustrade at no. 39 Downside. This feature appears to be the only one in the wider area and was granted consent in 1978. It is considered that within this historic context there is no precedent set here for this form of development and the current character is that of bungalows which have been altered and extended with roof extensions and flat roof rear extensions. Some Juliet balconies exist however the flat roof extensions are not used for balcony areas. The cumulative impact of such a development would be harmful to the existing built environment adding bulk to the existing developments, representing alien features and elevated structures throughout the locality. For these reasons this development should be resisted.

Residential amenity

Despite the use of privacy screens and the proposed balcony being set in from the side boundaries this development will result in elevated activity in close proximity to the properties on either side. The principle of such a use of the flat roof will be harmful and detrimental to occupiers of neighbouring properties. A precedent would be set for further similar development which would be to the further detriment of occupiers.

Recommendation

REFUSE

The proposed balcony is an alien feature detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing bungalow and surrounding built environment. It would result in unneighbourly development setting a harmful precedent which would cumulatively degrade the locality and residential amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan.

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 discussing those with the Applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 20th June 2022

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 21 June 2022