

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0696/26 Recommendation: REFUSE

Site: 66 Buckingham Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Proposed first floor extension above existing ground floor side extension on north side. Raised ridge height, first floor rear extension above existing ground floor extension, accommodation within extended roof with rear dormer, garage conversion and new front porch.

Date of Site Visit: 22nd June 2026

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional neighbour notification: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a detached, two storey dwelling with flat roof garage to the north side and ground floor half hipped roof extension to the south side. It has a hipped roof with symmetrical chimneys. There is a flat roof single storey rear extension. The dwelling house is at the north end of the street, near to the intersection with Upper Shoreham Road. The area comprises a variety of property types, with various design and use of materials visible within the street scene. Many properties are substantial on generous plots with front driveways and large rear gardens.

Originally consent was sought for the raising of the ridge of the main dwelling, and first floor extensions to the north and south, conversion of the garage, a front porch and front dormers. A first floor extension was also proposed to the rear above the ground floor extension. This included a roof extension to the rear of the original roof with a rear dormer to allow for accommodation within the existing and new roof.

Officers advised that they could not support the application as submitted. The first floor extension to the south was contrary to Development Management Standards in terms of the proximity to the boundary. The front dormers were out of keeping in the street scene and the enlarged roof and rear dormer combined with the rear first floor addition was considered to be overdevelopment and represented poor design.

Amended plans have been received showing a first floor side extension to the north only. The south extension and front dormers have been removed. The ridge is now shown as 1.2 metres higher than the original roof height, (300mm lower than the original plans) and the rear extension remains with a reduced scale dormer. The garage conversion and porch are as originally submitted.

Consultations

West Sussex County Council Highways: -

The garage will be lost however off street parking is provided to meet the needs of the site.

The LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in severe cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

Representations: - Representations received from the owner/occupiers of no. 64 Buckingham Road relating to the original and amended scheme, making the following comments: -

- No separation between the south side extension and the boundary.
- Overbearing, lack of light.
- Regard should be given to Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan and impact upon neighbour amenity
- Out of scale development significantly adding to living space.
- Substantial scale and glazing on the east elevation.
- Rear dormer directly overlooks garden.
- Out of proportion with the plot and surrounding area.
- Replacement roof form that is substantially enlarged.
- Second floor construction.
- The dormer does not serve existing roof space but purpose built second floor accommodation within a new enlarged roof form.
- Agent refers to properties in Upper Shoreham Road, these are not comparable.
- Agent refers to other proposals on Buckingham Road, these are not comparable.

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 (August 2026)

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

As amended the proposed development has been improved with the removal of the side extension to the south and the front dormers. The north side extension as shown is a subservient addition set down from the ridge (as increased) which

complies with Development Management No. 2. Although the ridge height is increased, the set down of the side extension from the increased ridge allows for an appropriate relationship.

It is considered that the ridge as increased is not in its own right harmful. It is the increase of 1.2 metres in height, combined with the rear addition at first floor and enlarged roof plus the addition of the proposed dormer that gives rise to an overly large development. The raised ridge continues to the rear with the extension at first floor 4 metres in depth. The development to the rear is overly large, dominant and out of scale with the existing building. It does not represent a subservient design which relates to the existing building form and scale. It is dictated by the depth of the round floor extension, leading to overdevelopment and poor design in this case.

It is an overly large and bulky development which does not comply with the principles contained in Development Management Standard No. 2. The rear ridge does not drop below the main increased ridge and the development is therefore not subordinate. It will be clearly visible from the street when approaching from the north and south with the large expanse of additional rear roof and the dormer. The dormer represents a third storey extension and not a loft conversion. By extending above the existing rear extension this gives rise to an overly deep extension with a large scale roof, this cannot be supported. It would set a precedent for future development which is not consistent with the existing street scene or host building.

The Council's Development Management Guidance states the following: -

"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."

"In particular, the proposal should not be allowed to over-dominate the house."

It is considered that the large first floor extension combined with the rear dormer and new roof will be development which will over dominate the building. It is out of scale, design and character.

The development proposed adds a large scale addition to the roof of the property which is not subservient.

The side extension, garage conversion and front porch can be supported in this case. There will be no adverse impact upon visual amenity as a result of these developments.

The applicant's agent refers to the development as a full remodel and that it should not be considered as an extended dwelling house. However, the proposed extensions represent rear additions and roof extensions to the existing building. If considered as a remodel this development would still be deemed overdevelopment and harmful to the street scene.

Residential amenity

The proposed building at first floor would project to the rear at first and second floor beyond existing, however it is not considered that there will be any substantial harm in terms of residential amenity in this case. The dormer and rear first floor windows will overlook the garden to the rear at a distance in excess of 22 metres. The side openings proposed are rooflights. No significant overlooking, loss of light or overbearing impact would occur in this case.

Recommendation

REFUSE

The proposed increase in ridge height, combined with the first floor rear extension, roof extension and rear dormer, results in a dominant and excessive scale of development which is harmful to the character of the existing building and contrary to Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation N

1. Refusal with amendments

Case Officer: Hannah Barker

Date: 3rd September 2026

Authorised by: Peter Barnett

Date: 3 September 2026