Expiry: 22/1

# Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: AWDM/1542/24 Recommendation – Refuse**

**Site: 121 Slonk Hill Road, Shoreham**

**Proposal: Raising of roof ridge to create first floor (amended re-submission of AWDM/1251/24).**

**Date of site visit: 8/11**

**Neighbours checked: Y**

**Additional neighbour notifications: N**

This application relates to a detached hipped roof bungalow with an almost chalet or modular appearance. It is on the south side of Slonk Hill Road, one of 42 bungalows in a row with very similar eaves and ridgelines and similar appearance - Nos. 45 to 127 (odd).

The property shares a driveway on its west side with No. 123 with paired garages at the head. There is a 1.8 metre wide passage between Nos. 119 and 121. A single storey extension has been added to the rear and the bungalow has been clad in blue composite cladding.

The bungalows sit down from the road and the land continues to slope down into the rear gardens. There is also a modest climb up the road from The Drive, to the west, before sloping down towards the east beyond the site.

The site is not in a conservation area and is not listed. There are no protected trees on the site. There is no known flood risk associated with the site.

This application follows a recent refusal for a very similar proposal. The latest proposal differs in two main respects. The overall increase in roof height is reduced by 300mm from 2 metres to 1.7 metres. The rear first floor window is obscurely glazed below 1.7 metres.

**Relevant Planning History**

AWDM/1251/24 – Raising of the roof ridge to create first floor. Refused 12.11.24

AWDM/1631/24 – single storey rear extension. Granted 1.12.20

**Consultations**

None.

**Representations**

6 representations received, 5 in support of the application.

Expiry: 22/1

1 objection received, from No. 116, summarised as follows:

- These properties are bungalows. A two storey property will spoil the view of the street.
- It will look odd in its appearance.
- Loss of sea view.

**Relevant Planning Policies**

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2,15 and 18
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

**Planning Assessment**

**Principle**

The proposal involves 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.

A similar proposal was refused last November for two reasons:

1. The proposed development by reason of its scale, height and design would introduce a visually dominant and obtrusive form of development culminating in harm to the appearance of this bungalow and the wider streetscene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. First floor rear windows will overlook neighbouring gardens either side causing a loss of privacy to the detriment of their residential amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Of primary consideration is whether these two refusal reasons have been overcome in this application. The latest proposal differs in two main respects. The overall increase in roof height is reduced by 300mm from 2 metres to 1.7 metres. The rear first floor rear window is obscurely glazed below 1.7 metres.

**Visual amenity**

No.121 sits very close to its neighbour at No. 119 with virtually the same eaves and ridge lines. No.123 is the other side of the shared drive and it too has a very similar eaves and ridge line. All the bungalows from No.45 to No. 127 have a similar scale with some modest variance due to the slight up and

down of the road level. They are all set back from the pavement edge below road level.

In allowing the appeal at No. 42 in 2021 for an additional storey (**APP/Y3805/D/21/3281320** refers) the Inspector argued the following:

8. Regarding the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, while the proposed additional storey would depart from the prevalence of bungalow forms in the neighbourhood, the following combination of factors would help the enlarged building mass to visually assimilate within its setting.

9. There is some variation in building form and fenestration of dwellings in the vicinity of the appeal property, including various dormers on some dwellings. The undulating topography of Slonk Hill Road draws the eye, and viewed on the street from the west, the proposed development would appear against a backdrop of building mass on rising ground. Viewed on the street from the east, the raised height of the proposal would echo the peak of ground and building mass further along Slonk Hill Road. The substantial tree line to the rear off the host row of properties further adds to the visual variety of the backdrop. This backdrop of various elements, together with the pitched roof profile and use of materials matching the existing building would help the additional storey assimilate visually within its setting.

The same considerations do not apply in this case. There is less variation in the eaves and ridge lines of these bungalows. There is no tree back drop and the bungalows themselves are set down from the road and closer to it unlike those on the north side which sit up and away from the road. None of the properties at Nos. 45-127, or opposite have extended the original ridge height or added dormer windows, unlike at the eastern end, and as such retain their more modest original scale and appearance.

The nearest extended roof is at No. 68, 225 metres to the east and on the opposite side of the road. Contextually, it is not considered to set a precedent.

Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan 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:*

Expiry: 22/1

*• 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; and not have an unacceptable impact on adjacent properties, particularly residential dwellings, including unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, outlook or open amenity space;*

*When considering applications for extensions or alterations to dwellings, proposals will be expected to comply with the criteria contained in the Council's adopted Development Management Standard No.2 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings"*

Development Management Standard No.2 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings states:

*2.5 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 the street scene generally.*

*2.6 The following principles should also help to ensure that the criteria discussed able are met:*
*• Extensions should generally respect the architectural period and style of the existing dwelling and the area.*
*• External construction materials should usually match in colour and texture the materials of the existing dwelling.*
*• Windows or other openings should be in scale with the extension and should be in line with and match the proportions and style of existing windows.*
*• On a dwelling with a pitched roof, extensions should also have a pitched (or lean-to) roof if they are visible from the street, from a public place, or are two-storey extensions.*

The 300mm reduction in height of the new extension still leaves it 1.7 metres taller than neighbouring bungalows. It would still be visually intrusive in this row. The resultant eaves and ridgeline would obviously project above that of the adjoining bungalows and would appear too prominent and incongruous in the streetscene. The result would not constitute a good standard of design and the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area.

The design of the windows in the new floor, particularly on the frontage are also not in keeping with the very traditional design of the fenestration of these bungalows and would draw even greater attention to this extension to the detriment of the area.

**Residential amenity**

Obscurely glazing the rear windows to a height of 1.7 metres off finished floor level will prevent overlooking. These windows are probably necessary for

means of escape purposes so they would need to be on restrictors to prevent wider opening when in general use to protect neighbours garden from overlooking. The cill level of the rooflights at 1.6 metres or higher will also ensure neighbours are not unacceptably overlooked.

**Recommendation**

**REFUSE for the following reason:**

1. The proposed development by reason of its scale, height and design would introduce a visually dominant and obtrusive form of development culminating in harm to the appearance of this bungalow and the wider streetscene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? Y**

**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 reasons 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 discuss the best course of action.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Case Officer: | MOK | Date: 22/1/25 |
| Authorised by: | Peter Barnett | Date: 22 January 2025 |