Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0891/21 Recommendation – REFUSE

Site: 32 Falcon Close, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Ground and first floor side extension including front pitched roof dormer and flat roofed dormer to rear.

Date of site visit: Use of Google Maps and photos

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a semi detached chalet bungalow with front and rear flat roof dormers and an attached garage to the side built up to the boundary. The property matches in appearance and design the general character of Falcon Close and the flat roof dormers are an original feature here. Falcon Close is a large cul de sac facing towards a central green area.

Consent is sought to build above the existing side garage with a first floor extension extending the gabled roof to the side along the existing ridge line. A front gabled roof dormers is proposed to the front and a flat roof dormer to the rear. Materials are proposed to match existing.

Representations

2 representations received:

Objection from owner/occupier of no. 31 Falcon Close - The proposed two storey extension on the boundary is only 75cms from our two storey house. Not including roof overhangs. This is far too close they would not be able to build or maintain the side of their property as have no access unless coming onto our land. The proposed plans would make our properties look attached and lose all visibility of the Cedral board cladding on the side of the house. The garage on the side boundary takes light and the proposed would increase this loss. Front and rear dormers result in overlooking. Loss of view of Green. This would set a precedent, affect the character and be overdevelopment.

Representation from owner/occupier of no. 149 Old Fort Road – No objection to the development as it stands but concern that the south facing roof could become a terrace/balcony. A condition to restrict this is requested.

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 (July 2021)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

The proposed development is clearly visible within the street scene. The extension of the roof to the side with the large, bulky front dormer will provide a prominent development which will be overly large and out of keeping in design and scale. The dormer will extend from the ridge projecting forward almost to the ground floor, filling the full width of the proposed side extension. In addition the side extension will be built up to the boundary. This will give rise to a terracing effect which will be harmful to the character and appearance of the locality and will set a precedent for further development which would further degrade the appearance of the locality. This is contrary to Development Management Standard No. 2 which states that there should be a set in of at least 1 metre from the side boundary of first floor additions to avoid the loss of spacing between dwellings.

It is noted that the side development at no. 31 Falcon Close adjacent permitted under AWDM/0965/17 reduced the spacing between the dwellings; however the assessment in that case made reference to the distance still remaining to the boundary. “This spacing between the side gables still allows for visual separation of the dwellings and does not give rise to a terracing effect that would not be in character here.” It is therefore considered that this previous consent does not set a precedent for the development in this case. It cannot be supported for the reasons set out above.

Residential amenity

The side extension and front and rear dormers will bring the bungalow closer to the neighbouring property abutting the garage at the ground floor and bedrooms at first floor. There are no side windows proposed at no. 32 and no. 33 has only a side garage window. There will therefore be no overlooking, loss of light or overbearing impact as a result of the development directly adjacent to the neighbouring property. The front and rear dormers will overlook the front and rear gardens however this will be no greater than existing where there are extension dormers. It is not considered that there is any justification for refusal on the grounds of residential amenity.

Recommendation

REFUSE

1. The proposed side extension, by reason of its scale, width and proximity to the boundary, would result in a loss of space between buildings which would be harmful to local character and the surrounding street scene. Moreover, if permitted, the Local Planning Authority would find it difficult to resist further similar proposals related to other dwellings in the road, the cumulative effect of which would give rise to an unacceptable 'terracing effect' that would be contrary to Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, Development Management Standard No. 2 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

2. The proposed front dormer is unacceptable in that it is excessively large, poorly positioned and does not relate sympathetically to the existing building. It would therefore be out of keeping with and detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and make it difficult, if permitted, for the Local Planning Authority to prevent similar additions to other dwellings, the cumulative effect of which would detract from the visual amenities of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, Development Management Standards No. 2 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

Informative

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(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 6th September 2021

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 6 September 2021