Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0510/13 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 109 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5HB

Proposal: First floor extension on west elevation.

Date of site visit: 9 May 2013

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is a detached bungalow which sits on the corner of Old Fort Road with Winterton Way. The bungalow has been extended into the roof with large flat-roofed dormers to the east and west roofslopes. There is a pitch-roofed ground floor extension on the west side towards the rear of the property which sits below the top of the dormer on the west side.

The application is proposing to construct a first floor over the ground floor extension. It will raise the height of the building from 5.4m to 6.6m, with an increase in vertical wall height from 3m to 5m. The top of the extension will be level with the ridge of the original bungalow. A small terrace is proposed at the front on a new flat roof.

Consultations

None

Representations

None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’ National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading of 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.

Visual amenity

Saved policy AH7 (and the associated supplementary planning guidance) states that the design and materials of an extension should be sympathetic to the original dwelling. An extension should be subordinate to the main dwelling with a roof in keeping with the existing dwelling.

The proposal would result in the currently subservient extension becoming a much more prominent and dominant building on this exposed corner site. The increase in vertical wall height would serve to emphasise its height in relation to the existing bungalow. The visual impact would be worsened by the higher eaves height which results in an overtly two storey extension to this single storey building (the rooms in the existing roof do add a second floor but they maintain the single storey form of the building by virtue of not altering the low eaves height of the original bungalow).

It is considered that the extension would be overly dominant and out of scale with the existing bungalow and would also be out of keeping with the character of development immediately on this corner where there are bungalows immediately to the north in Winterton Way. On the opposite side of the road to the west is a two storey dwelling, formed by extending the former bungalow. To the east there is a bungalow but this does have consent to be redeveloped with a pair of two storey dwellings. However, the two storey buildings are appropriate in that they are the result of extensions or redevelopments which address the property as a whole rather than adding an extension of inappropriate scale to part of the property, as is the case here.

The applicant's agent has referred to an extension at 3 Coastguard Cottages which was allowed at appeal in 2009 (ADC/0363/08) which he feels is similar to this proposal. That was for a first floor extension above a corner element of a single storey wing which connected a pair of 2 storey houses (1 and 2 Coastguard Cottages) with a third 2 storey house in The Burrells. In that case the Inspector felt that it would not "introduce a discordant or inappropriately dominant feature into the street scene." However, the presence of existing 2 storey forms on that corner was an important consideration in that appeal and that same relationship does not exist here. Consequently, it is not considered that any weight can be given to that appeal decision when determining the merits of this current application.

Residential amenity

The extension will be 2.5m from the northern boundary of the site with 2 Winterton Way and will be positioned forward of the front wall of that bungalow. The increased height of the building will have some impact on outlook for the occupiers of the bungalow, although there is an integral garage nearest to the boundary rather than habitable accommodation. A bedroom window is proposed at first floor in the north elevation of the extension which will look directly over the frontage of the bungalow to the north. While unneighbourly, it does not enable overlooking into the property or into private

areas at the rear. On balance, an objection on grounds of harm to the residential amenities of 2 Winterton Way is not considered to be sustainable.

The extension would not impact on any other neighbouring dwelling.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the reason:-

The proposal, by reason of its height and design (incorporating high eaves and a two storey form), would be a dominant extension, out of keeping in scale and appearance with the existing building and would detract to an unacceptable extent from the visual amenities of the locality. It would therefore conflict with saved policies AG1 and AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan and the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 19 June 2013

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 19 June 2013