DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

Application Number: **Recommendation – Refuse**
AWDM/1264/14

Site: 34 Kings Walk

Proposal: First-floor front extension with 2nd floor balcony

Neighbours checked: Y
Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is a detached two-storey building with front balcony and large picture windows. The property is of a conventional design and style.

The site is in an outer residential suburb of Shoreham, facing onto the beach.

The proposal is to install a front balcony and large exterior platform accessed via the roof, encased by glass balustrade and galvanised steel rail and atop timber supports

Relevant Planning History

SU/181/97/TP
Pitched roof to existing garage and extension to garage to form sunroom
Approved 16-12-1997

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

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'

Consultations

None

Representations (summarised)

None

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Flood Risk

The site falls within Flood Zone 2, but the additional accommodation would be located in the roof, elevated from the land and it would not exacerbate the risk to human health.

Visual amenity

There is some variance to the form of buildings along the immediate section of Kings Walk to which the application property belongs.

However all the buildings have a consistent scale (two-storey) and conventional shaped roofs, even if hipped, pitched or gabled, with no intrusions above the eaves.

It is this continuity in roof and scale that contributes toward establishing the character of the street.

The proposal would appear highly incongruous with this character by providing an unduly prominent structure that would rupture the eaves line and sit at odds with the planes of the hipped roof, appearing as a poorly integrated and visually obtrusive feature against the host building.

Due to its forward siting and elevation above the eaves, this proposal would be highly visible in long views up and down the street, and from public views across from the beach. Its harm would be readily appreciable from these viewpoints.

Attention to it would be drawn by the choice of building materials, contrasting with the traditional palette of the host building and neighbouring buildings.

This would be contrary to Saved Adur Local Plan Policy AH7, which states alterations to existing houses will be expected to be designed so that *'design and materials are sympathetic to both the original dwelling and the area in general.'*

In reaching this conclusion, the local authority has accounted for Government instruction within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Neighbours

Views would be obtainable from the front balcony and roof platform. However due to the suggestion of the installation of a screen to the front balcony, intrusive loss of privacy would be avoided as overlooking would be restricted to the beach and front gardens of neighbours, which already lack privacy,

The structure is lightweight in its design, so would not overbear or overshadow.

RECOMMENDATION:

The agent was advised by email on the failings on the merits of the proposal, and that the application would be refused. No response was received prior to application expiry, so it is duly refused.

REFUSE

The proposal, by reason of its prominent siting, positioned above the eaves line, and poorly integrated building materials, would appear visually obtrusive and incongruous, being harmful to the character and appearance of the immediate street scene, as well as the character of the host dwelling. As such the proposal would be contrary to Saved Adur Local Plan policy AH7, and the relevant policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informatives

i) 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. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to resolve those matters within the timescale allocated for the determination of this planning application. However, the Local Planning Authority has clearly set out, within its report, the steps necessary to remedy the harm identified within the reasons for refusal – which may lead to the submission of a more acceptable proposal in the future. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

ii) This refusal relates to the following drawings:-

Drawing No. GA02 titled Proposed Plans, Elevations and Section AA date received 29-09-2014

DELEGATED

Case Officer
Sign Matthew Porter Date 17-11-2014

Authorising Officer
Sign Peter Barnett Date 18 November 2014