Expires 22/3/07.

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0052/07 **Recommendation - Refuse Application**

Site: **12 Orchard Avenue Lancing West Sussex BN15 9EA**

Proposal: **First-floor side extension (front)**

The Application

The application property consists of the northern end dwelling of a terrace of six situated on the east side of Orchard Avenue. To the north is a further terrace of four properties whilst to the rear, separated by an access path, are the gardens belonging to dwellings on the west side of Grinstead Lane. Opposite are terraced properties set in a similar layout to the east side of Orchard Avenue. The adjacent property to the north, No.14, has a two storey side extension with a hipped roof (built under L/378/76) that abuts the boundary with an eaves line overhanging the applicant property by 200mm. A small window 400mm high sits under the side eaves line of this extension. The applicant property also has a two storey side extension (built under L/143/84), the design of which differs radically from the neighbour's. It is a flat roofed addition above an existing garage that features a front pitch and dormer window and sits slightly beneath the small side window of No.14 due to a small (approx. 400mm) difference in ground level between the terraces. The proposal is to remove this front pitch and dormer and to extend out to the building line of the property. The existing window will be reused but sit below the line of the windows on the main house with a small pitched façade above. The eaves lines will therefore not be level.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties

No.10 Orchard Avenue have No Objection to the proposal.
Lancing Parish Council object to the extension as it is out of keeping with the rest of the property and unsympathetic to the streetscene.

Contributors

No representations have been received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adur District Local Plan: AG1, AH7

West Sussex Structure Plan: CH1, DEV1

Planning Assessment

The key planning concerns with this development surround whether it will enhance the existing extension to a sufficient degree that will meet the Council's Development Control Standards.

The existing extensions at No.12 and No.14 would not be acceptable additions under current planning standards. The 1976 two storey extension at No.14 has been not only built onto the boundary (as opposed to 1 metre from the boundary as currently required) but also overhangs it. The latter extension at No.12 has similarly been built up to the boundary but has a front rear sloping pitched roof with dormer window at first floor level that is out of keeping with the dwelling itself and the streetscene in general. It is presumed that this style was recommended to maintain a visual break between the sets of terraces.
The key question is whether it is possible to adjust this poor development in a way that will improve the visual appearance of the extension without compromising the specific demands of the Council's design standards.
The initial drawings showed the front pitch of No.12 to be extended into a wall in line with the main dwelling with a pitched façade above but beneath the existing eaves line. This was considered out of proportion with the existing roof line and was not the solution that the applicant had envisaged. Following a discussion with the architect the opportunity was given for amended plans to be submitted bringing the extension in line with the existing building lines to make it a more sympathetic addition to the existing dwelling. The applicant indicated that his preference was for the extension to be similar to one opposite at No.11 which incorporated a pitched façade roof. However, due to the idiosyncrasies of the site, (with the neighbouring high level window and overhanging eaves) the amended plans did not improve the proposal sufficiently. Whilst the eaves is now in line with the main dwelling, the pitched façade has had to be offset and hipped to allow for guttering to sit between the dwellings and for light to be maintained to the high side window of No.14. This plan, although technically a minor improvement on the previous, would enhance the terracing effect of

the previous extensions, would not be balanced with regard to the roof shapes, and would be a more visually apparent and cramped addition than the existing.
It has become abundantly clear from these drawings that it is unachievable to alter the existing extension at No.12 within the boundaries of the Development Control Standard. Arguably a design compromise needs to be agreed that enhances the current poor development in a manner that is subordinate and reclusive to the main dwelling and streetscene whilst retaining an integrity of design demanded by current standards. Unfortunately the proposals submitted do not constitute a sound compromise.

Recommendation

REFUSE on ground that :-

further infilling the gap between the two terraces,
B5AR: The proposal would form an ~~obtrusive and~~ incongruous feature, that would be visually out of keeping with existing development and detrimental to the streetscene, thereby conflicting with the policies of the West Sussex Structure Plan (CH1, DEV1) and the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7)

Case Officer:.....

Date:21/3/07.....

21/3