Expiry Date – 30/7

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0870/19 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 8 Collingwood Court, Shoreham

Proposal: Proposed first floor extension to front (north) elevation.

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit:

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This property is a semi detached house at the head of Collingwood Court. This pair is one of 4 identically built pairs in Collingwood Court dating from the early 1970's. As built these semi's have paired central recesses at first floor in their front elevations. Benbow Close, to the west, is a terrace of similarly designed houses.

The application site has recently added a two storey side extension.

These properties are not in a conservation area and not listed.

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/0444/17 - Two-storey side extension with first floor front balcony, and single-storey rear extension, infill of ground floor front entrance. Granted 26.7.17

SU/0251/02 - Attached Garage On West Side And Extension To Lounge. Granted 15.1.03

SU/192/89 – Single storey side extension. Granted 6.10.89

SU/533/78 – Extension to side. Granted 16.1.79

Consultations

None undertaken.

Representations

Two objections received, one from the neighbour at No. 7

- Loss of light to No. 7's bathroom.
- These plans appear to be a replica of a 2017 refusal.

- The plans indicate that rainwater pipes, eaves and guttering will overhang No.7
- There is a dividing wall which as drawn implies a cavity wall whereas in fact this is a single brick garden-type wall.
- The drains, which are under the front porch, are also not shown on the drawings.
- This extension would cause the front porch at No. 7 to be in a tunnel
- The front aspect of the property at No. 8 would completely change the overall ambience, balance and natural look of the whole row of houses and would cause deep distress to an elderly resident.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adur Local Plan 2017 policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development is acceptable as it extends a family home within the established residential area of Shoreham Beach. The character of Collingwood Court and neighbour amenity are the main issues for consideration.

Character and appearance

Visual amenity

No.8 forms part of a building group which has as an original feature a first floor recess at the front. Notwithstanding narrow side extensions at Nos. 4 and 6 the character of these 10 houses and its distinctive first floor front recess is retained.

The proposed extension would remove, entirely, this characteristic recess. It would be out of character with its neighbours and would harm the appearance of the streetscene of Collingwood Court.

It is contrary to policy 15 of the adopted Adur Local Plan which states:

Development should be of a high architectural quality and respect and enhance the character of the site, and the prevailing character of the area, in terms of proportion, form, context, massing, siting, layout, density, height, size, scale, materials, detailed design features and landscaping. Development should:

・ Enhance the local environment by way of its appearance and character, with particular attention being paid to the architectural form, height, materials, density, scale, orientation, landscaping and layout of the development;

- Make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area;

Development Management Standard No. 2 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’ also states:

THE APPEARANCE

The most important basic principle is that any extension should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and street scene generally. In particular, the proposal should not be allowed to over-dominate the house or clash with its appearance.

2.6 The following principles should also help to ensure that the criteria discussed above are met:-
(a) Extensions should respect the architectural period and style of the existing dwelling and the area.

This is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 which states;

Para *122* -

Planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account:

d) the desirability of maintaining an area’s prevailing character and setting

Para 127.

Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;

b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;

c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting,

d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

The proposal does not respect local character. It is contrary to local plan policy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The deep front recesses are an integral feature of the original design of these houses. Nos. 5 and 6 Benbow Close have built similar extensions under separate permissions, AWDM/1379/17 and AWDM/0521/16 refer.

The 2017 permission at this address initially also included a proposal to extend as proposed now. This was negotiated out of that permission. Also in 2017 an application for a similar extension at No. 6 Collingwood Court was refused on the grounds that it would harm the character and local distinctiveness of these houses. In February of this year a joint application for 5 and 6 to extend as proposed now, was approved, AWDM/1815/18 refers. A condition was attached that they be completed as one development.

To extend No. 8 as now proposed will further unbalance this pair of houses, 7 and 8 and remove an integral part of their original design. This would be harmful to visual amenity.

Residential amenity

No. 7 has a recessed bathroom window and a lantern light over her porch. We do not protect light to bathrooms and hall ways. Not all light will be lost as a result of this proposal.

Recommendation - REFUSE for the following reason:

The proposal by reason of its size, siting and design would appear alien and discordant and as a consequence would be harmful to the cohesive townscape and local distinctiveness. As such it is contrary to Local Plan policy 15, Development Management Standard No. 2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority is willing to meet with the Applicant to discuss the best course of action and is also willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? No.

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 23.7.19
Authorised and signed by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 23 July 2019