Expiry: 18/9

# Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: AWDM/0963/24 Recommendation – Refuse**

**Site: 12 Oldfield Crescent, Southwick**

**Proposal: First floor side extension over part of the existing ground floor side extension to form en-suite bathroom. Removal of one chimney.**

**Date of site visit: 11/9**

**Neighbours checked: Y**

**Additional neighbour notifications: N**

## Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a detached inter war house on the north side of Oldfield Crescent. The property has an integral garage and double height front bay with tile hanging detail. It is otherwise finished in pebble dash render under a clay tiled roof. It has a single storey flat roofed extension on its west side up to the shared boundary with rear garden access on the east side.

The property is not in conservation area, is not a listed building and there are no protected trees on the site.

It is proposed to build a first floor side extension over the existing ground floor addition. The extension is shown to have a mock pitched roof around it. It is shown to be set back from the front of the property by 400mm and 4.3 metres deep, extending to the edge of the existing landing window. A small rectangular window is proposed in the front wall. The front elevation is shown to be tile hung wrapping around the side wall slightly and otherwise finished in pebble dash to match the house.

## Relevant Planning History

SW/8/85 – Change of use to rest home with ground and first floor extensions to rear and side. Granted.

SW/88/81 – Ground and first floor extension at rear. Granted

SW/118/79 – Single storey extension to front. Granted

## Consultations

None.

Expiry: 18/9

**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 (December 2023)

**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.

**Residential amenity**

The extension sits forward of No. 14 but it is not considered that it would cause undue harm to occupiers living conditions.

**Visual amenity**

The proposed extension will be visible in the street particularly on approach from the west as it sits forward of the adjacent house and is on the shared boundary. It is designed with a mock pitched roof, out of keeping with the original property. The proposed front window is anomalous. It bears no relation to the scale or design of the original windows.

Policy 15 of the Local Plan states that:
*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;*
- *• Make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area;*

*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 says:

Expiry: 18/9

*‘3.7 Side extensions should be set back at least 1m from the side boundary. This is particularly important in the case of two-storey extensions since, if adjacent dwellings were both extended up to the side boundary, it would create a “terracing” effect which would destroy the existing character of the area. If the area is spacious in layout and the buildings are large, a space greater that 1m may well be necessary to avoid an appearance of overdevelopment and a cramped effect.*

*3.8 Side extensions being clearly visible from the road should be designed to closely match the existing dwelling. In particular they should have a roof in keeping with the existing dwelling which, in most cases, will mean a pitched roof. False mono- pitched facades are not acceptable on the front elevation only; they may occasionally be acceptable if they run around all sides of the extension. The extension should usually be set back slightly from the main front wall of the dwelling to create a visual break and ensure the extension is subordinate to the main dwelling and to avoid difficulty in matching wall and roof materials.’*

The prevailing character of Oldfield Crescent is one of attractive detached and semi detached houses in generous plots with obvious gaps to the side boundaries, particularly at first floor level.

The proposed extension is on the boundary and the adjacent property, No. 14, has only a very modest gap to the common boundary. The extension would close this gap resulting in a cramped appearance out of keeping with the pattern of development generally.

In addition, the proposed extension’s appearance is out of keeping with the original house. The mock pitched roof and small front window do not respect the inter war character of the house and will not contribute positively to the sense of place locally.

**Recommendation**

**REFUSE** for the following reason:

The siting and design of the extension would result in a cramped and unsympathetic development harmful to the appearance of the house and to the wider streetscene. It is therefore contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, Supplementary Planning Guidance in Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings and the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023).

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

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 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 provide pre-

Expiry: 18/9

application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Case Officer: | MOK | Date: 18/9/24 |
| Authorised by: | Peter Barnett | Date: 18 September 2024 |