Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0881/20 Recommendation – REFUSAL

Site: 22 Downside, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Proposed detached pitched roof garage in rear garden with storage area at first floor level.

Date of site visit: 6th July 2020

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The site is located on the north side of Shoreham to the south of the A27. The site as existing comprises of a bungalow on a corner plot with Downside to the south and Tottington Way to the west. The ground level rises significantly to the rear of the site. The side of the site is enclosed by a close boarded fence with gates onto Tottington Way. Consent is sought for a detached double garage with a pitched roof with storage area at first floor level. The garage is 7.2 metres wide and 7.5 metres deep and is 4.6 metres high. It is positioned adjacent to the rear boundary of the site set forward, closer to the highway than the neighbouring bungalow to the north.

The area is characterised mainly by bungalows many of which have been extended some with roof extensions, although these are mainly in Downside.

Relevant Planning History

ADC/0653/07 – West Side Extension.

ADC/0338/09 – Two/three bedroom dwelling (Eco House) at rear (fronting Tottington Way) incorporating existing garage structure. Refused and Dismissed at Appeal.

AWDM/1188/19 – Proposed detached two bedroom bungalow with new vehicular access and hard surfacing. Refused and Dismissed at Appeal.

Representations

Representation received from owner/occupier of no. 1 Tottington Way: -

- The application is misleading.
- It states that a new access is not required however vehicular access was blocked to the old garage when the property was extended, the current access is not safe or approved.
- The old garage still stands and a green house has been demolished to make way for the new garage.
- The garage doors face east and not the road?

- Block plan is not to scale and does not show the extensions which have been carried out to the property.
- The building looks like a two storey house, outside of the building line, has a high roof line and is close to the boundary.
- Accessing the garage would mean driving over the dropped kerb.
- There is the possibility it may be used for other purposes such as a habitable dwelling in the future.
- If approved it would set a precedent for a similar development to the rear of 28 on the other side of Tottington Way.

Representation received from owner/occupier of no. 2 Tottington Way: -

- Following the 2 previous planning applications being rejected I am nervous that this structure is being built with a view to a later application for consent to convert to dwelling.
- There are errors and omissions on the drawings. The buildings on the site are incorrectly shown.
- No dimensions from property boundaries. Ridge height is missing, the main door faces east. Block plan does not show up to date development.
- The size is excessive. Garage is visually intrusive and will change the character of the road result in loss of light.
- The garage does not follow the building line.
- Sets a precedent

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 (February 2019)

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 garage has a large footprint and will be excessively high with the proposed pitched roof with storage, there is also a first floor window proposed. The height of the proposed building combined with the position of the building on higher ground level and set forward close to the highway will give rise to a large and prominent building which will dominate the street scene. It will sit forward of the bungalow to the north representing a similar scale and height when viewed from the highway. This building is therefore overdevelopment of the site and will give rise to a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance and layout of the existing

street scene. This building does not appear in the street scene as an ancillary domestic outbuilding due to its scale and siting. The first floor storage area, separate access and distant position from the house give rise to concerns that it could easily be divided from the main house and provided with its own curtilage in the future. It will result in the excessive development of the existing garden land at this property which as existing contributes to the character of this area. Any development such as this at no. 22 will set a precedent for similar development at no. 28 opposite which would in turn result in further harmful development.

Residential amenity

As stated above the building is set forward of no. 2 Tottington Way to the north, in addition the building will be clearly visible from other properties in Tottington Way. However as was the case with the proposed dwelling as referred to above, there is some spacing between the bungalow to the north and the garage therefore it is not considered that there will be any significant impact in terms of residential amenity. A reason for refusal cannot be warranted on this ground.

Recommendation

REFUSE

1. The proposed garage by means of its size and scale, and its position forward of the bungalows to the north, would represent a prominent and incongruous feature within the street scene. It would therefore be detrimental to the visual amenities and residential environment of the locality and, if permitted, would set a precedent for further similar proposals related to other dwellings in the road, the cumulative effect of which would be to harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan and the NPPF.

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

1. Refusal with discussion

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 4th August 2020

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 4 August 2020