Expiry Date - 16-7-15

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/0748/15**

Recommendation – REFUSE

Site: **16 Windlesham Gardens**

Proposal: Single storey extension to garage and two-storey extension, both to front (west) elevation

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: /N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a single storey garage extension and a two-storey front extension, the details and dimensions of which are set out in the submitted drawings.

The application property is a detached two-storey building built in the inter-war period. It has curved front bays and a catslide roof with gables.

The surrounding area is an inner neighbourhood of Shoreham, residential in its character.

Relevant Planning History
None

Consultations (summarised)
Southern Water: *Require formal application for any new connection to the public sewer to be made by the applicant or developer*

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework
Saved Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Visual amenity

Windlesham Gardens is an attractive street, locally distinctive in the way the properties in it are arranged around an oval shaped garden with mature planting. The architectural consistency to the buildings in the street (a preponderance of the inter-war period) compliments the garden setting.

It is clear the scaling, arrangement, and design approach to the buildings was purposely considered when the layout and appearance of this street was first devised, suggesting a conscious intent that no single building was to be more prominent than its neighbour.

No. 16 Windlesham Gardens is very much of this prevalent character, being a large detached property displaying architectural features typically characteristic of the late inter-war period. This includes 2 storey half circle bay windows and dual gabled roof. It sits amongst a row of similarly designed inter-war period buildings, directly facing onto the central garden.

The low eaves of its catslide front roof slope, nestled between the two gabled protrusions, effectively breaks up the bulk and mass of the building's frontage - ensuring it is no more prominent in the street than its neighbouring properties.

In contrast, the excessive scale and gabled design of the proposed front extension would give the host building undue prominence in the street compared to its neighbours. This new extension would directly compete with the building's existing gable protrusions. Moreover, any sense of sympathetic scaling down would be lost as the new extension would sit proud of both gabled protrusions. Its eaves line at the same height of the first floor window cills would be visually awkward, and the large expanse of floor-to-ceiling glazing would be an entirely alien feature completely at odds with the prevalent character of surrounding properties.

The end result would be a highly obtrusive addition that would give the host building an intrusive character greatly and unacceptably at odds and out of keeping with its surroundings.

For these reasons, the proposal fails to satisfy criteria (b) of Saved Adur Local plan policy AH7 in that an extension would only be supportable if its design is sympathetic to both the original dwelling and the area in general. Additionally, the scheme would fail criteria (b) and (c) para. 2.6 of Development Control Standard No. 3 *Extensions and Alterations to dwellings*, which stipulates that extensions 'should respect the architectural period and style of the existing dwelling and the area' and that windows and other openings should be line with and match the proportions and style of existing windows.

The sensitivity of a building's frontage and the need for sympathetic treatment of it is recognised in Development Control Standard No. 3, which states front extensions are particularly difficult to incorporate successfully with the existing house and street scene (para. 3.16), and which explicitly acknowledges that 'the

introduction of large areas of additional glazing at the front of a house (i.e. a large glass porch …) is rarely successful and should usually be avoided'.

The proposed garage extension is of an appropriate scale and appearance, and would not result in harm to the integrity of the host building or the street scene.

Such conclusions are in conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework which sets out, in para. 56 & 60, the mandate on local planning authorities to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness as good design is indivisible from good planning.

Residential amenity - neighbours

The development is orientated to the front of the building where sufficient distance would be retained between it and neighbouring buildings, so as to avoid harm arising onto the living conditions by way of overbearing, overshadowing, or overlooking/loss of privacy.

Recommendation

REFUSE, for the following reason:

The proposed front extension, by reason of its forward siting, excessive scale and gabled predominately glazed design, would appear as a highly obtrusive addition that would give the host building an intrusive character unacceptably at odds and out of keeping with the locally distinctive character and appearance of the street, in conflict with criteria (b) of Saved Adur Local Plan policy AH7 and allied Development Control Standard No. 3 *Extensions and Alterations to dwellings*, as well as paragraphs 56 & 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informatives:

1. *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. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason for the refusal, approval has not been possible.*

2. *This refusal relates to the following drawings:-*
   Drawing No. 1045.18 titled Proposed Block & Site Plan date valid 21-05-2015
   Drawing No. 1045/16a titled Proposed Sections date valid 21-05-2015
   Drawing No. 1045.14a titled Proposed Ground Floor & First Floor Plan date valid 21-05-2015
   Drawing No. 1045.15a titled Proposed Roof Plan date valid 21-05-2015
   Drawing No. 1045.17a titled Proposed Elevations date valid 21-05-2015

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N/A

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 13-07-2015

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 14 July 2015