Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1584/18 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 1 Wessex Walk, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Single storey front extension to south elevation

Date of site visit: 25 October 2018

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to an end of terrace house at the corner of Wessex Walk and Chanctonbury Drive. The house sits below the level of Chanctonbury Drive and fronts a footpath and green open space which is a characteristic of this estate. Each house in the terrace has a flat-roofed porch on the front which is attached to the neighbour's porch to form a feature at the front of each pair.

The application proposes to remove the porch and to construct a flat roofed extension across the whole of the front to the same depth to provide a larger living room. The front door will be removed and the entrance to the house will be from an existing door on the west side. The front of the extension will be solid with the exception of a window.

Relevant Planning History

None

Consultations

None

Representations

None received

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 2018)

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 proposal will replace the existing porch containing a front door and glazed side wall with a brick extension containing a window but no door and with a solid side wall. The extension will run across the full frontage of the house.

It will be out of keeping with the character of Wessex Walk which contains houses with a flat-roofed entrance porch on the front which is attached to the neighbour's porch to form a feature at the front of each pair.

This proposal is on the end of the terrace nearest to Chanctonbury Drive and is prominent in views from that street as well as from the pedestrianised Wessex Walk. The loss of the glazed porch and entrance door would be at odds visually with the established uniform character and appearance of the street and would result in sufficient visual harm to warrant refusal.

Advice in the Council's SPG DM Standard No.2, states that:

"3.16 *Front extensions are particularly difficult to incorporate successfully with the existing house and streetscene. They should not usually extend significantly beyond the "building line", or abut side boundaries. For this reason, front extensions on terraced properties (other than small porches) will not usually be allowed. In the case of semi-detached or detached dwellings, front extensions will only be allowed where the extension can be successfully assimilated into the streetscene and not unduly affect neighbours*."

In this case it is not considered that the extension will be successfully assimilated into the street scene.

Residential amenity

The proposal will not cause harm to residential amenity.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the following reason:

The proposed front extension, by reason of its design and appearance, replacing the existing glazed porch and front entrance door with a solid extension, would be at odds with the established uniform character and appearance of houses in Wessex Walk to the detriment of the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, Supplementary Planning Guidance comprising: Development Management

Standard No.2 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’ and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework

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

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.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 12 November 2018

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 13 November 2018