Expiry:30/4

# Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: AWDM/0277/25 Recommendation – Refuse**

**Site: 20 Monks Avenue, Lancing.**

**Proposal: First floor extension to south elevation.**

**Date of site visit: 5/2**

**Neighbours checked: Y**

**Additional neighbour notifications: N**

## Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a semi detached house on the splayed corner of Monks Avenue and Bishops Close. As built these houses have side catslide roofs. In this case a wide side dormer has been added. This is a common extension to these houses in the area, though No. 22 is unextended. The property has also been extended to the side at single storey level in an angled arrangement. There is also an outbuilding close to the front boundary. Its use is unknown.

The area is defined by a mix of two storey houses and bungalows with Bishops Close, a development of 10 house bult in the last 20 years to the south east.

The site is not in a conservation and is not a listed building. There are no TPO's on the site. The site is within flood zones 2 and 3 and is known to be at intermediate risk from surface water flooding.

It is proposed to extend over the side extension by a maximum 2.5 metres in width. The existing side dormer is also to be enveloped into the new hipped roof proposed which sits down from the main ridge by 900mm. The extension would create a sixth en-suite bedroom.

This application follows refusal of a similar but wider first floor extension earlier this year, see history below.

## Relevant Planning History

AWDM/1626/24 – First floor side extension. Refused.

ADC/0119/08 - Rebuilding of shed adjacent to house (retrospective). Granted

L/106/97/TP – Single storey side extension. Granted.

L/100/82/TP – First floor side extension to provide additional bedroom and bathroom. Granted.

Expiry:30/4

**Consultations**

**Lancing Parish Council**: supports the application.

**Representations**

Two objections received from No. 22 and No. 12 summarised as follows:

Loss of light to garden.
Claustrophobic
Overdevelopment
Overlooking
Loss of symmetry to roofline
Harm to visual amenity
Nesting seagulls must be given consideration

**Relevant Planning Policies**

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

**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.

The reduced width of the extension does not change the overall impacts of it for neighbours or the streetscene.

**Residential amenity**

Policy 15 of the adopted Local Plan states:

*Development should*
*• Make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area; and not have an unacceptable impact on adjacent properties, particularly residential dwellings, including unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, outlook or open amenity space;*

*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" (as amended or superseded by other Council*

*guidance in force at the time an application is considered) or any other appropriate national standard.*

In terms of neighbour amenity Development Management Standard No.2 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" states:

*2.2 Proposals will not be granted planning permission if they have an unacceptably adverse effect on neighbouring properties. The main detrimental effects could be related to:*
*• Privacy - the proposal should not result in direct overlooking of rooms in neighbouring properties, nor excessive amounts of overlooking of garden areas.*
*• Daylight - any proposal should not reduce the daylight to neighbouring properties to an unacceptable extent.*
*• Outlook – the fact that a neighbour may be able to see an extension would not in itself make a proposal unacceptable, the outlook of neighbouring properties should not be dominated by the extension since this could be overbearing and oppressive*
*2.3 The extent to which the above factors are affected will depend on the size and position of the extension, as well as its location and orientation relative to neighbouring properties*

No. 22's private rear garden runs along the entire rear garden boundary of No. 20, to the north. No. 20 is set off this boundary by less than 5 metres. The extra width and height proposed would have an overbearing impact on occupiers of No. 22 when using their garden. It would also directly impact the amount of sunlight received to it.

A window is proposed to be added to the east wall of the extension. This would further overlook No. 22's garden in the more private area behind their garage.

**Visual amenity**

Policy 15 of the adopted Local Plan states:

*Development should be of a high architectural quality and respect and enhance the character of the site, and the prevailing character of the area, in terms of proportion, form, context, massing, siting, layout, density, height, size, scale, materials, detailed design features and landscaping. 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;*

In terms of visual amenity Development Management Standard No.2 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" states:

*2.5 The most important basic principle is that any extension should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing*

Expiry:30/4

*dwelling and the street scene generally. An extension which is acceptable in a low density modern development may not be acceptable in a town centre location. In particular, the proposal should not be allowed to over-dominate the house or clash with its appearance.*

The proposed extension would give the property a stretched appearance further unbalancing this pair of houses. The original catslide roof form would also be completely lost. This pair of houses is on a very prominent junction and visible on approach from some distance. The extension proposed would over dominate and consume the character of the original house and its neighbour and as a consequence would be harmful to the appearance of the original property and the wider streetscene.

**Flood Risk/Drainage**

The extensions are at first floor. No further flood risk is anticipated.

**Highways**

There is a single off street parking space for this dwelling. On street parking locally is heavy but it would not be reasonable to refuse on this basis.

**Recommendation**

**Refuse for the following reasons:-**

1. The proposed extension, by reason of its scale, mass, proximity to the north boundary and design, represents an overdevelopment of the site which would be harmful to the amenity of occupiers of 22 Monks Avenue due to an overbearing impact, loss of light to their garden and increased overlooking. It is therefore contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, adopted Development Management Standard No.2 “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed extension, by reason of its scale, mass and design, would over dominate the original house on this prominent junction and further unbalance this pair of semi detached houses to the detriment of visual amenity. It does not respect or enhance local character. It is therefore contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, adopted Development Management Standard No.2 “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**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 reasons for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision

Expiry:30/4

to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Case Officer: | MOK | Date: 23/4/25 |
| Authorised by: | Peter Barnett | Date: 23 April 2025 |