Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0905/21 Recommendation – REFUSE

Site: 63 Ingleside Crescent, Lancing, West Sussex

Proposal: Two storey side extension

Date of site visit: 6th July 2021

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a two storey semi detached dwelling with gabled roof and lean to front porch. There is a front garden and driveway which continues to the side of the property. There are many other similar properties either side and opposite the site and there are also bungalows within the street.

Consent is sought to extend the building to the side at two storey replicating the height and design of the house up to the side boundary. Also proposed is a new front porch increased in width and height.

Lancing Parish Council: - No comment

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 (July 2021)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

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 proposed extension will be clearly visible within the street scene as a continuation of the existing building up to the side boundary. It will therefore give rise to a cramped form of development with no spacing between the building as extended and the neighbouring side boundary. Such a development would set a precedent for additional similar development which would result in the loss of spacing between properties therefore giving rise to a detrimental impact. Should the adjacent dwelling propose the same development the properties would abut each other altering the built form of the area significantly.

This form of development is contrary to guidance set out in Development Management Standard No. 2 which states that “Side extensions should be set back at least 1 metre 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.”

It is noted that there are many examples opposite of single storey side extensions and garages built up to the boundary however the spacing between the properties still remain and the existing character is retained. The applicant’s agent has made reference to no. 72 Ingleside Crescent opposite the application site which has been extended up to the boundary at two storey. There is no planning history for this development therefore it is assumed that it was built some time ago prior to the current policies and guidance being adopted. It is a clear example as to why this form of development is harmful and should be avoided in the future. It does not set a precedent here.

Residential amenity

Due to the proposed extension of the building toward the side of the existing neighbouring property where there is a blank side elevation the development will not give rise to any adverse impact in term of amenity the existing blank elevation will be closer and not harm will arise as a result. There may be some distant loss of outlook from properties to the rear due to the enclosure of the gap yet this would not warrant a refusal upon these grounds. The attached dwelling will be screened from the proposed two storey extension by the host dwelling and the proposed front extension is limited in depth and set in away from the boundary.

Recommendation

REFUSE

1. The proposed side extension by reason of its scale and width in proximity to the boundary would result in a loss of space between buildings which would be harmful to local character and the surrounding street scene. Moreover, if permitted, the Local Planning Authority would find it difficult to resist further similar proposals related to other dwellings in the road, the cumulative effect of which would give rise to an unacceptable ‘terracing effect’ that would be contrary to Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, Development Management Standard No. 2 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

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

1. 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. 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(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 10th August 2021

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 11.08.2021