Expiry Date - 17/07/2023

# Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: AWDM/0569/23 Recommendation – APPROVE**

**Site: 1 Shingle Road Shoreham-by-sea West Sussex BN43 5RH**

**Proposal: Demolition of existing conservatory and detached garage and construction of single storey side extension.**

**Date of site visit:** 12/06/2023

**Neighbours checked: Y**

**Additional neighbour notifications: N**

**Site and Surroundings:**

The application property is situated on the westerly side of Shingle Road within a residential area of Shoreham Beach. The property is a detached bungalow situated on a corner plot at an oblique and rather irregular angle, sharing boundaries with properties belonging to Old Fort Road to the south and The Meadway to the west. Elevations of the property comprise predominately render with brick detailing, it has a gable roof finished with plain tiles, and openings are white UPVC. The property exhibits a conservatory projecting from the side (north) along with a detached garage which is situated further north of this and abuts the boundary with No. 71 The Meadway. An access gate connects the conservatory with the garage and leads to the rear garden space of the property, of which is predominantly hardstanding paving slabs with plentiful planters and vegetation bordering the westerly boundary.

There is no distinct pattern of properties in the surrounding area, Old Fort Road to the south in-particular comprises a diverse range of properties in terms of their design, form and massing, marked by ‘statement’ architecture. Whilst properties northerly of the site are more consistent with one another in this respect, the application property reflects more of an individual style alike to those properties along Old Fort Road.

The application property is within Flood Zones 2 and 3.

**Proposal:**

Permission is sought to demolish the side conservatory and detached garage to the north of the dwelling and construct a tandem side extension to create a dining and music studio. In essence, the proposal the subject of this application reflects the granted scheme under AWDM/1932/21. The extension

would extend a maximum of approximately 11m from the side (north) elevation and have a depth of approximately 5.9m at maximum.

The dining and music studio would be constructed using dark cedral cladding with dark concrete tiles for the proposed pitched roof. Similarly, dark window frames are proposed. The dining room aspect of the proposal would be smaller in scale with a ridge height of approximately 3.6m. Where-as the music studio's ridge would step up from this to a height of approximately 4m, before stepping down again to a 3.6 height to the rear 'tail'.

**Representations:** None received.

**Consultations:** None.

**Relevant Planning History:**

Planning permission granted at the application property for demolition of conservatory and garage and erection of single storey extensions under AWDM/1932/21, decision issued 27/01/2022. (This scheme is very similar to what is being proposed and had not been implemented at time of site visit).

Also for the Demolition of Existing Bungalow & Erection Of New Detached Three-Bedroom Bungalow (Retaining Existing Garage) under SU/180/93/TP/8413, decision issued 13/12/1993.

**Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance**

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 1, 15
Supplementary Planning Guidance comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework 2021

**Planning Assessment**

***Principle***

The proposal comprises upgrading a residential property located within the built-up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers, and whether flooding issues have been addressed.

***Visual Amenity***

The proposed extension would be readily visible from the public realm and is of a generous size. Further, it would have a contemporary appearance which would differ from the appearance of the existing dwelling. Notwithstanding, regard must be had for the previously granted scheme under AWDM/1932/21

which was assessed under the same policy guidance. The previous scheme strongly resembles this proposal and in-fact was of a slightly larger and more awkward appearance, where-as this proposal is of a more sympathetic form and layout which more closely relates to the existing dwelling. Moreover, given the artistic character of the local area, the situation of this property in an anomalous plot, and the extension's subservient form below the ridge height and not protruding forward of the existing dwelling, it is considered that it would not be so harmful to the visual amenities of the area to warrant a refusal.

***Residential Amenity***

The proposed extension would project towards the side (east) of the adjacent neighbour to the north-west No. 71 The Meadway. The footprint of the proposal would barely exceed what exists through the garage. Moreover, the only openings to this neighbour's side elevation is a frosted window and the front entrance door. The granted scheme under AWDM/1932/21 extended parallel with this neighbour's side wall where-as this proposal would virtually maintain the separation distance as exists through the garage. Thus, it is considered that no material overbearing or overshadowing would occur.

A high shrubbery at this boundary would largely obscure views of the proposal from the rear of No.71's garden. Whilst it is considered that no significant loss of outlook would occur by virtue of the presence of the vegetation, the applicant has agreed to obscure glaze the large portrait window to the side (west) elevation to overcome any material overlooking should the vegetation be removed. It is considered that no overlooking issues would arise as a result of the positioning and size of the other openings proposed.

***Other***

The applicant has demonstrated that the floor space created would be at the same level to the existing floor of the dwelling. The Council is satisfied that the proposal would have no adverse impacts for flood risk due to the minor nature of the works.

**Recommendation:**

**APPROVE** subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard Time Limit
3. Materials
4. Obscure Glazed Portrait Window

**Informatives:-**

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the

application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

Case Officer: Jason Albon Date: 14.07.2023

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 14 July 2023