Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1516/24 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 50 Clarendon Road, Shoreham

Proposal: Flat roofed first floor rear extension with grey cladding.

Date of site visit: 24/4

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a semi detached two storey inter war house on the south side of Clarendon Road which is off Kingston Lane. The property has been extended at rear ground floor level. The rear of the property is visible from a public alleyway to the east adjacent to no. 52.

The site is not in a conservation area and is not listed. There are no protected trees on the site. It is not in a flood zone but is at risk of surface water flooding.

Permission is sought to erect a first floor extension set off the boundary with No. 52. It is flat roofed and proposed to be cedral clad in Pearl Grey. It measures 3.4 metres in depth and is 4.5 metres wide being set off the boundary with No. 52 by 3.6 metres. The proposed flat roof extends just above eaves height. The extension creates a new master bedroom.

This application follows a refusal for a full width first floor rear extension also flat roofed.

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/2034/20 - First floor extension over existing ground floor extension to rear. Refused.

SU/52/85 - Single-storey extension to rear. Granted

Consultations

None.

Representations

5 neighbours notified. No responses received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and15

‘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.

The previous application (AWDM/2034/20) was refused for a single reason:

The proposed first floor extension, by reason of its proximity and depth in relation to No. 52 would result in an overbearing impact and loss of outlook for residents. The proposed flat roof is also out of character and would be visually harmful. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, adopted Development Management Standard No. 2 - Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework.

This application was assessed via desk top only as site visits were prohibited at the time due to covid restrictions.

Neighbour amenity/character

Policy 15 of the adopted Adur Local Plan looks for new development to 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;
• Include a layout and design which take account of the potential users of the site;
• 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” (as amended or superseded by other Council guidance in force at the time an application is considered) or any other appropriate national standard.

Adopted Development Management Standard No. 2 states in relation to rear extensions in para 3.2:

The closer a rear extension is to the boundary of a neighbouring property the more likely it is to adversely affect that property, by way of overlooking or loss of daylight.On semi-detached or terraced dwellings single-storey rear extensions which abut, or are within 1m of a common side boundary with an attached dwelling, should normally be no deeper than 3.5m. Whilst two-storey (or first floor) rear extensions that are within 1m of a side boundary with an attached dwelling should normally be no deeper that 2m, extensions abutting the boundary will not normally be permitted.

And in para 3.6

'On single-storey rear extensions that are not clearly visible from the road a flat roof is usually acceptable. However, two-storey rear extensions should normally have a pitched roof to match the existing house. A false mono-pitch façade, running along all the elevations of a rear extension, may be acceptable where a full pitch would substantially reduce the light to the adjoining properties.'

The extension now proposed will not be harmful to occupiers at No. 52.

It has been possible to visit the site this time and also to enter No. 48. No. 48 is a different design with a side kitchen window. This kitchen window would previously have looked across the garden of No. 50 until No. 50 built their ground floor extension. It would face the flank wall of the proposed extension. Light to this window would be significantly compromised. This kitchen does also have an obscurely glazed rear door behind an open porch. However, it is considered that its main source of light and outlook is to the side over the flat roof of No. 50's current extension.

The proposal includes a flat roof. Development Management Standard No. 2 specifically seeks a pitched roof on two storey rear extensions, to match the original dwelling. A flat roof would not be in keeping and would not enhance local character. There are no obvious flat roof two storey rear extensions nearby. The use of grey cedral cladding would also be out of character and very prominent in this elevated position.

Recommendation REFUSE for the following reasons:

The proposed first floor extension, by reason of its proximity and depth in relation to No. 48 would result in a loss of light and outlook and would have an overbearing impact. The proposed flat roof and use of cedral cladding is also out of character and would be visually harmful. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, adopted Development Management Standard No. 2 - Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings and the relevant paragraphs of 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, clearly setting out the reason 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 with the Applicant the best course of action.

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

Case Officer:	MOK	Date: 29/4/25
Authorised by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 29 April 2025