Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0384/19 Recommendation – REFUSE

Site: 3 Lesser Foxholes, Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex

Proposal: Proposed dormer to north elevation

Date of site visit: 26.03.19

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is a two storey dwelling built in a unique modern design and style with prominent catslide roof. It is a detached dwelling with parking and garden area to the property frontage.

The direct, surrounding locality is characterised by similar style properties with matching design features; the area has a spacious and open plan feel.

Consent was granted for a substantial front extension, which incorporated an extension of the cat slide roof with roof lights (AWDM/0235/13). The works have been completed.

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 (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 immediate street has a locally distinctive character and appearance. This is principally derived from the overtly modern architectural style and design of the buildings within it. This also includes the application property. Although some of the original character of this building has been removed by the recent addition (which was approved by Members contrary to the Planning Officer's recommendation), the prevailing character remains here. The buildings share a common characteristic form and shape with 'L' shape footprints and distinctive asymmetrical frontages. The building positively contributes to the local distinctiveness of its immediate surroundings.

Its contribution to the street scene is made greater by its long plot frontage addressing the street, together with its open driveway out onto it. It is a prominent building with a strong visual presence in the street scene. The proposed dormer would be a very prominent feature due to both its large scale, siting and it being an alien feature both in relation to the existing building and within the locality. As stated above the simplistic character of this building and its neighbours would not allow for a dormer addition which would be complimentary to the existing building design. Although there are some dormers within this locality these are not on properties with this distinctive character, these are also much more modest additions. Furthermore the excessive amount of glazing proposed here would be to the detriment of the appearance of the building and would emphasise the negative impact here.

The proposed dormer would be out of character and detrimental to the appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. This would also set a precedent for further similar development which would further degrade the appearance of the individual dwellings and wider street scene.

Residential amenity

The proposed dormer will not have any adverse impact upon residential amenity. No increased overlooking or loss of privacy would occur.

Recommendation

REFUSE
The proposed dormer, by reason of its excessive width, unduly prominent scale and unsympathetic poor design, would form an obtrusive and incongruous feature that would relate poorly to the existing scale, form, and architectural qualities of the host building to the detriment of the established character and appearance of the street scene and its local distinctiveness. It would thereby conflict with the policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to good design.

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 9th April 2019

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 9 April 2019