Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0967/20 Recommendation – REFUSE

Site: 4 Cheal Close, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Single storey front extension

Date of site visit: Assessment carried out using Google Maps

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a semi detached chalet bungalow within a cul de sac on Shoreham Beach. The dwelling as existing has front and rear dormers and a flat roof rear extension. There is off street parking with an open frontage and the bungalow is clearly visible within the street scene. Surrounding the site are various style bungalows and chalet bungalow. Consent is sought for a flat roof front extension, this is proposed at 5 metres in depth which is to provide the main entrance and a home office.

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 (February 2019)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises 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.

Visual amenity

The proposed front extension will be clearly visible within the street scene. It is of flat roof design in an attempt to replicate the rear extension and other examples of flat roof development surrounding the site. The applicant's agent has provided supporting information showing examples of similar development to property

frontages within Shoreham Beach. Due to the style and age of much of the housing within this locality there are many flat roof front porches and garages which are original features. Some of which have been added however within the context of the original design, or are historic features for which no planning records exist. Therefore this form of flat roof development is commonplace. Many rear single storey extensions also exist and these are similar to the design of this extension and that which already exists to the rear at the application site.

However in this case the addition to the bungalow does not replicate any similar development or connect to any existing flat roof element at this property frontage. Its depth at 5 metres also contributes to its incongruous appearance. The height of the roof will sit above above the eaves and will have an awkward in appearance. It is not considered that any reduction to this height would overcome the objection here. While not projecting beyond the front of the bungalow to the east, the front extension will nevertheless be prominent and out of keeping in design and scale with the surrounding area. It will be detrimental and unsympathetic to the character and appearance of this pair of semi-detached bungalows and harmful to the street scene.

Residential amenity

Due to the position of the proposed extension away from the boundary with the attached bungalow, no 2, to the west, and it being adjacent to the blank side wall of the adjacent bungalow to the east, no. 6 there will not be any loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact as a result of the proposed extension.

Recommendation

REFUSE

The proposal would form an obtrusive and incongruous feature that would be visually out of keeping with existing development and detrimental to the street scene, thereby conflicting with policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan and the NPPF.

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

1. Proactive refusal with discussion

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 29th July 2020

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 29 July 2020