Expiry Date -

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – REFUSE**
AWDM/0113/14

Site: **7 Hardy Close**

Proposal: **Replacement balustrade to existing balcony on front (west) elevation.**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a new balcony enclosure to the front (west) elevation of an end of terrace two-storey dwellinghouse. This will consist of stainless steel posts and toughened glass panelling. It will be positioned atop the flat roof of the garage. When the officer visited site, the original balcony had been removed.

The application property is situated in a small cul-de-sac on Shoreham Beach, an outer residential suburb of Shoreham.

Relevant Planning History
None

Consultations
None

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising:
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
Assessment of Saved Policies (ADC 2013)
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle

Visual amenity

The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the street scene and the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Apart from some very minor detailing of the doors and windows, the terraces in the cul-de-sac have a uniform character and appearance. This is derived from their architectural form including use of matching exterior materials and finishes, the rhythm and pattern of fenestration, and the consistency of design of the balconies.

The unity of these terraces makes for a pleasing and harmonious appearance to the cul-de-sac, positively contributing to the street's local distinctiveness.

To introduce a significantly contrasting design of balcony enclosure would have a harmful visual impact on both the architectural form and integrity of the building and the terrace it relates to, and the street scene it sits within. The proposal would introduce an incongruous feature which would disrupt the cohesion and uniformity of the terraces, being readily apparent from the public street.

It would set a precedent for other properties to introduce varying balcony designs. The end result of this can be seen in adjacent Weald Dyke. In this street there are now several different balcony designs and any original uniformity to properties has been much diminished, to the detriment of the street's character.

As a consequence, the character and appearance of the street scene and the host dwelling would be harmed. The proposal would therefore be contrary with the aim to prevent development detracting from the local urban environment.

Residential amenity

The balcony replaces an existing one so the nature of overlooking onto neighbours would be no different than at present.

Recommendation

It is recognised 7 Hardy Close is reasonably exposed to weather conditions along Shoreham Beach, and this can affect the longevity of certain building materials. The desire for durable materials is understandable. However in this particular case the choice of materials to the new balcony does not override the visual harm identified in the above assessment.

Free pre-application advice was provided to the applicant by the Planning department on his proposal. The issue of the design of the new balcony was identified at this point, and the advice given was that a planning application was unlikely to receive approval.

The applicant decided not to follow this advice and submitted an application, which is duly refused.

REFUSE for the reason:-

The proposal, by reason of its design and use of materials, would be out of keeping with the existing architectural form of the balconies in the rest of the terrace terrace. It would be detrimental to the locally distinctive qualities of the street scene by disrupting the visual cohesion and uniformity of the terraces within it. If permitted, the local planning authority would find it difficult to resist similar proposals related to the other properties in the cul-de-sac, the cumulative effect of which would be to harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved Adur District Local Plan Policy AH7 and the relevant planning policies set out in 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 discussing those with the Applicant at pre-application stage. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 20-3-2014

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 21 March 2014