Expiry Date -

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – REFUSE**
AWDM/0157/12

Site: **35 East Meadway**

Proposal: **Flat roofed garage attached to front of existing garage (in place of car port)**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: /N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is in a small cul-de-sac in an outer residential area of Shoreham.

The application property is a residential property built in a distinctive modern design and style, with a steeply pitched rear roof slope. It has white rendered walls. Surrounding properties are of similar design and style, but with tile hanging to their elevations.

An open-ended car port has been built off the front wall of the application property.

Permission is sought for a front garage extension to replace the car port, attached to the front of the original garage. It would be 5.2m wide and 7.1m deep with a flat roof 2.7m high, lining through with the flat roof of the existing garage.

Relevant Planning History

None

Consultations

Adur & Worthing Councils: The ***Environmental Health*** Officer recommends the precautionary condition

Representations

None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

South East Plan (GOSE 2009): BE1, CC1, CC6
Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7
Appendix 11 ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings

Planning Assessment

Visual amenity

The existing car port is lightweight in its design. It is open ended. The proposed front extension is solid walled and of a greater length and width than the existing car port. The car port is therefore not a direct comparison to the suggested front extension (and it did not benefit from express planning permission).

The length to which the new front extension protrudes forward of the application building and the neighbouring properties to either side would make it stand out obtrusively in the street. This harmful effect would be exacerbated by the width of the extension.

As such the proposal would be seen as a unusually large and overly assertive feature in the street when viewed face-on at the entrance of the cul-de-sac from East Meadway, and looking from the north and south within the cul-de-sac itself. It would be out of character with the open frontages and building line of the cul-de-sac, with the enclosure of the space to the south especially harmful to the established appearance of the street scene.

There are no other extensions protruding so far forward of the main house in the cul-de-sac. Construction of the proposed extension would remove an established hedge along the southern boundary, which helps screen the existing car port structure from view from this direction. In contrast the indicative new planting would have little screening effect and is not guaranteed to last in perpetuity. Indeed from the drawings it is unclear if it is actually feasible to provide any planting in the very limited space available between the long flank wall of the garage and the boundary. Views within the cul-de-sac would be compromised by the presence of an imposing length of solid flank wall of an insipid utilitarian design.

It is concluded that the proposed garage would appear as an unduly dominant and unsympathetic feature within the street scene that would detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such it would conflict with policy in so far that the required good quality design required by Saved Adur District Local Plan policy AH7 would not be met.

Residential amenity – effect on existing dwellings

The proposed extension would partly ‘wrap around’ the open front garden of the neighbouring dwelling to the south, No.29, resulting in a rather awkward appearance. However, the proposed garage extension would be sited sufficient distance away from the front elevation of this dwelling to avoid any adverse amenity impact.

Contaminated Land

The site is not contaminated so an informative would be sufficient to raise the applicant’s awareness of this issue.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the reason:-

The proposal would, by reason of its large size, prominent siting, utilitarian design and external appearance, represent an obtrusively assertive and unsympathetic feature within the street scene. As such, the proposal would be detrimental to the established character and appearance of the locality in conflict with Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies) AG1 and AH7, and South East Plan (GOSE 2009) policies BE1 and CC6

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 16-04-2012

Authorised and signed by: Jo Morin Date: 17 April 2012