Expiry Date - 09-06-2015

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/0502/15**

Recommendation – REFUSE

Site: **69 Beach Green Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex**

Proposal: **Two-storey side and rear extension to provide a full two-storey 5 bed dwelling with full hipped roof. 1.8m high boundary wall to west side.**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: /N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for:-

Remodelling of the existing building by way of a two-storey side and rear extension with full dual hipped roof, to measure (at max) 8.2 metres in height, 14.2 metres in length, and 12 metres in width.

The application property is currently an asymmetrical two-storey dwellinghouse on a prominent corner plot. Surroundings properties are of a modern gabled ended design with pitched roofs, some asymmetrical.

The surrounding area is an outer suburb of Shoreham, on the beach.

Relevant Planning History
None

Consultations
Adur & Worthing Councils: *Require addition of precautionary condition and PFA informative*

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
Saved Adur Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Visual amenity

In the immediate locality surrounding buildings are predominately wide bungalows with low eaves and gable ends and shallow pitched roofs. Those buildings that are two-storey are gabled ended with notably shallow pitched roofs. There are wide expansive views of the sky and properties are set back from road junctions which have wide corner verges. This provides an open and spacious character, which is locally distinctive to this part of Shoreham Beach.

The proposed remodeling of No.59 would result in a building that would be incongruous to its surroundings. The introduction of this larger scale building, at full two-storey, would be unduly prominent visually because of its additional bulk and mass that would appear excessive in relation to surrounding buildings. This would be notable to all elevations but most especially on the south (rear) elevation where the resultant building would be set against the backdrop of the rows of bungalows along Mardyke. The east flank of the resultant building would appear cramped alongside the neighbouring building to the east, whereas currently there is generous spacing between the two buildings. The introduction of the deep dual hipped roofs would be highly incongruous with the architectural roof form of surrounding two-storey buildings which are characterised by simple shallow pitches.

Boundary treatments in the immediate area are low rise brick wall and hedging. This adds to the spacious and open character of the locality. The proposed 1.8 metre high wall would be highly incongruous and at odds with the area's prevalent appearance.

For these reasons the proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of Saved Adur Local Plan Policy AH7 related to householder extensions, in that the design is unsympathetic to the original dwelling and the area in general, and is contrary to the Council's adopted allied Supplementary Planning Guidance and relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to design.

Flood Risk

The site falls within flood zones 2 and 3. The applicant has confirmed their intent to flood proof the development by means of resilience and resistance techniques in accordance with Government guidance.

In the event of approval, these measures can be secured by condition. However it would be necessary to convey in careful wording that the raising of floor levels should not involve an increase in the height of the remodeled building, as this would be unacceptable visually.

Residential amenity – effect on existing dwellings

It is the immediate neighbours to the east and south who would be principally impacted upon by this development (it is physically removed from the remainder).

Neighbour to east (57)

This neighbouring detached building is a two-storey house with a two-storey rear projection giving it an L-shaped footprint. A conservatory extends off the rear wall. It has a side door in its west facing flank but no habitable room windows.

Currently there is generous spacing between both buildings. The asymmetrical roof of No. 59 provides the neighbour respite from its bulk and mass.

In proposing to extend hard up against the shared boundary at full two-storey height with high eaves, the resultant building would adversely overbear onto this neighbouring building resulting in a significant reduction in the light and outlook of the neighbour's conservatory to the detriment of the occupier's residential amenities.

Neighbour to south

This neighbouring building is a bungalow. It has a series of windows in its north wall that face onto the application site. The distance between the remodeled building of No. 59 and the bungalow's north wall would be some 9 metres, resulting in adverse overbearing onto this neighbour to the detriment of the occupier's residential amenities.

For these reasons the proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of Saved Adur Local Plan Policy AH7 related to householder extensions, in that the proposal would result in an unacceptable degree of overbearing effect onto neighbouring dwellings, and is contrary to the Council's adopted allied Supplementary Planning Guidance and core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to residential amenity.

Recommendation

The planning officer discussed the issues of concern of this proposal with the planning agent at an earlier stage, and the advice was to withdraw the application.

The agent wished to the application to be taken to a decision, and it is duly refused.

REFUSE for the reasons:-

1. The proposal, by reason of its excessive scale and full two-storey bulk and mass and alien dual hipped roof, would appear unduly prominent and visually incongruous with the prevalent architectural form of surrounding buildings to the detriment of the character and appearance and local distinctiveness of the locality in conflict with Saved Adur Local Plan Policy AH7 contrary to the Council's adopted allied SPG Development Control Standard No. 3 Extensions and Alterations to dwellings, and relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to design.

2. The proposal would, by reason of its excessive height and bulk and proximity to the neighbouring dwellinghouses to the immediate south and east, result in an adverse overbearing effect on the occupiers of those neighbouring properties to the detriment of their residential amenities in conflict with Saved Adur Local Plan Policy AH7 contrary to the Council's adopted allied SPG Development Control Standard No. 3 Extensions and Alterations to dwellings, and core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to residential amenity

3. The proposed 1.8m high wall on the western boundary would form an obtrusive and incongruous feature that would be visually out of keeping with the existing low-rise boundary features in the locality, thereby conflicting with saved policies AG1 and AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan

Informative

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.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 29-05-2015

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 2 June 2015