Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1639/15 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 21 Grover Avenue Lancing West Sussex BN15 9RG

Proposal: First-floor side and rear extension to east elevation.

Date of site visit: 26.11.2015

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property comprises a semi-detached house occupying a wider than average plot located on the west side of the junction of Grover Avenue with Irene Avenue. It has previously been enlarged by a single-storey extension on the east side having a largely flat roof with a pitched and tiled 'skirt'. To the west is the other half of the semi-detached pair, No.19 Grover Avenue. To the south is 85 Irene Avenue, a semi-detached house sited perpendicular to the application property.

The surrounding area is residential in character, made up primarily of pairs of semi-detached houses, but with some short terraces.

Permission is sought to erect a first-floor side and rear extension on the east side. The proposed extension would be built directly above the existing ground-floor addition and would be 5.2m wide extending a further 3m rearward (south), supported on brick piers. It would have a hipped and pitched roof to match the existing. The ridge of the main side element would be positioned approximately 300mm below the existing roof ridge and the ridge of the hipped roof over the rear-projecting element stepped down a further 300mm.

Planning History

Planning permission was granted in 2013 for an attached house on the east side of the dwelling (AWDM/1184/12) and will lapse this in February year.

Consultations:

Southern Water: A formal application for connection to the foul sewer will be required and an informative to this effect is sought.

Lancing Parish Council: No objection

Representations: None received

Relevant Planning Policies

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' National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012).

Planning Assessment

Principle

There is no objection in principle to the proposed development which involves an extension to an existing dwelling house.

Visual amenity

The existing extension does not relate particularly well to the existing dwelling having been built in poorly-matching bricks. However, it has little presence in the street scene given its single-storey scale, and is largely screened from surrounding views by the existing perimeter hedging enclosing this corner plot.

The resulting 2-storey extension will be far more visually prominent and appear somewhat over-wide in relation to the original dwelling. It's rather jarring appearance will be further heightened by the unusual form of the first-floor rear element (designed to avoid the line of a sewer which runs parallel to the rear of the existing house). The mis-matching face bricks will also become more visually apparent since the larger scale extension will be more exposed to public view.

The applicant has been requested to amend the application to provide a narrower 2-storey addition, but is unwilling to do so, commenting that the foundations of the existing ground-floor were deliberately designed to accommodate an additional storey. The applicant also refers to the fact that the attached house permitted under AWDM/1184/12 is wider than the proposed extension. However, it is worth pointing out that the approved dwelling was deliberately designed to match precisely the size, layout, form and detailed design of the original dwelling in order to integrate seamlessly within the streetscene. On the other hand, the design principles for extensions set out in the above SPG require that they appear subordinate in scale and appearance to the host dwelling. It is accepted that some degree of visual subservience will at least result from the slight set-back of the extension from the front (north) of the host dwelling and the series of lower roof ridges.

There have been a number of recent developments in the immediate vicinity comprising attached new dwellings and large 2-storey extensions. Some have been more successful than others in integrating into the street scene. In this respect it is pertinent that a similar form of 'over-wide' extension exists nearby at No.17 Grover Avenue, although that does not occupy such a prominent position on a corner.

On balance, although disappointing, it is considered the proposed extension will not appear so visually out-of-keeping or intrusive within the streetscene as

to justify refusal. In arriving at this conclusion consideration has been given to the fact that no objection has been raised by the Parish Council nor any representation received from nearby residents.

Residential amenity

There would be a minimum distance of 12 metres between the north side of No.85 Irene Avenue and the rear of the proposed first-floor extension. The above SPG states that on a corner plot a distance of 14m should be retained between principal window on an extension at the rear of one property and the side of a dwelling to the rear. There are no first-floor windows in the north side wall of No.85 and the small windows at ground-floor are clearly secondary in nature. Consequently, it would be difficult to argue the proposed extension would give rise to an unacceptable degree of overlooking or otherwise detract from the amenities of the occupiers this property.

The east side elevation of the extension facing Irene Avenue would include a wide window serving a bedroom. However there is a good separation distance of some 25 metres between this wall and the flank elevation of No.23 Grover Avenue, on the opposite side of the road.

The 'bulk' of the proposed first-floor rear-projecting element would have some impact on daylighting to, and the outlook from, the existing bedroom window in the rear (south) of No.21, but this is essentially a private matter for the applicant.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Face brick to match that on existing ground-floor addition. Plain roof tile to match existing, including bonnet hip tiles.
4. Windows to match style and opening pattern of those within the host dwelling, including matching window cills

<u>Informative</u>

1. Proactive Statement – Amendments

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 26.01.2016

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 26 January 2016