Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1584/23 Recommendation: APPROVE

Site: 34 Falcon Close, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Proposed rear first floor balcony

Date of Site Visit: 16th January 2034

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional neighbour notification: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a detached chalet bungalow with front and rear dormers. It is within a cul de sac of semi detached and detached properties of various design and character. Consent is sought to add a first floor balcony to the rear of the bungalow on the eastern side. One of the rear windows in the dormer is to be changed to a door leading onto the balcony enclosed with glazed balustrade with high level on either side. The balcony is 1.5 metres deep and 3.6 metres wide.

Representations: - 1 representation received from the owner/occupier of no. 32 Falcon Close objecting as the balcony will result in overlooking towards the garden and children playing. The house is used as an air B and B so strangers will be overlooking.

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 (December 2023)
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

The balcony is to the rear of the property therefore it will not be visible within the street scene. It will be seen from neighbouring properties on either side and to the rear. There are not any other examples of similar development nearby. Balconies are common on the beach in general and there is a front balcony on one of the neighbouring dwellings to the north within Falcon Close.

Consideration was given to the principle of the development and if this form of development was in keeping. It is considered that on balance the principle of the balcony can be supported here. It would not harm the character of the locality or the existing bungalow. It would not be a feature which would warrant a refusal in this case in terms of visual amenity.

Residential amenity

There are properties either side and to the rear of the site. To the east is the rear elevation of no. 35, which runs along the length of the boundary as it is a corner plot. No. 35 is close to the boundary and there is a wall. There are side obscurely glazed windows facing the site and velux roof lights. It is considered, on balance, that as this elevation has limited outlook and light and is clearly not the primary elevation of the dwelling, the balcony would not give rise to any unneighbourly loss of privacy or outlook. The side privacy screens on the balcony would limit overlooking towards the boundary.

Development Management Standard No. 2 states that, “the addition of a balcony to a property anywhere near the boundary would be likely to lead to problems of overlooking. Balconies on terraced or semi detached properties will therefore usually be resisted.” In this case the balcony is near to the boundary but for the reasons set out above it will not be significantly harmful to the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling. The property is detached.

To the west is a neighbouring dwelling not attached, there are flat roof outbuildings along the boundary. Due to the distance from the boundary it is not considered that the balcony will give rise to overlooking towards the rear of this property. In terms of the use as an air B and B, the applicants have confirmed that they let the house when they go away which is only 4-6 weeks per year. They have offered that the door to the balcony could be locked when guests are in and that they desire the balcony for their own use as their home. It seems reasonable to allow the applicants to moderate the use themselves and there would be no reason to consider that guests using the balcony would cause any more problems than the owners. However should there be any unacceptable noise or disturbance as a result then Environmental Health could deal with this as a noise nuisance.

Due to the orientation of the properties to the east, nos. 35 and 36 are to the side of the site, the rear garden of no. 36 is directly to the rear of the site. The balcony will

look over this garden to the rear of the property beyond in Old Fort Road. There is in excess of 22 metres between the balcony and the rear elevation of the dwelling to the south.

On balance, in the light of the above, the balcony can be supported as no significant adverse impact will occur that would warrant a refusal in this case.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Privacy screens as shown shall be installed prior to use and remain in place at all times.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation Y

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 5th February 2024

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 5th February 2024