Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1298/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 2 Seaside Road, Lancing

Proposal: Two storey extension to south elevation

Date of site visit: 13.09.16

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposal

The application site is a two storey semi-detached dwelling within the built up area of Lancing. The dwelling fronts onto Seaside Road positioned on the eastern side. Seaside Avenue runs to the south of the site. The immediate adjacent area comprises mainly of semi-detached or detached bungalows, with a two storey building to the south. In general, the pair of semi-detached properties no.2 and no. 4 Seaside Road are matching in form, design and appearance. They represent a prominent pair due to their unique form and character within this vicinity. They have a prominent matching front gable with cat slide roof which combined with their recessed porches are attractive symmetrical features. The property is sited almost as a corner plot with the front elevation of the pair clearly visible both within Seaside Road and on the approach from the east on Seaside Avenue. The southern side elevation of no. 2 is also clearly visible from Seaside Avenue.

Permission is sought to erect a two storey side extension to the southern side of no. 2. The extension is to be slightly set back from the gabled front elevation of the dwelling and run along the same depth as the existing dwelling. There is an existing detached, single, pitched roof garage to the side, set back to the rear which is to be demolished to enable the development.

The extension is to be 3.1 metres wide. The height will match that of the main ridge, reducing slightly to the rear. The roof form will be significantly altered to enlarge the existing rear gable, two storey projection to be encompassed within the new enlarged side gable. The height of the rear section of roof is to be increased from 6.7 metres high to 8.1 metres.

The extension will provide a garage and play room at ground floor and a master bedroom with dressing room and en-suite at first floor.

The plans as originally submitted omitted a drawn line attaching the proposed extension to the main ridge. To ensure correct and accurate plans are considered when determining this application a corrected plan was sought from the applicant's agent. This has been received and is listed below.

Consultations: Southern Water: - standard informative, connection to public sewer.

Lancing Parish Council: - No objections

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

Generally there are no objections in principle to the proposed extension which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality and the impact upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.

Residential Amenity

The attached semi no. 4 would not be impacted by the proposal which would be screened on the whole by the main building. Yet the rear projection would increase in bulk and height this would not warrant a refusal on this ground.

The dwelling directly to the south is a bungalow on a relatively large corner plot. Due to the distance from the boundary and the orientation of the bungalow, no. 3 Seaside avenue, it is not considered that the impact here would be such to warrant a refusal. The southern elevation is shown on the plans as being blank with a high level window only. Therefore there would be no overlooking, loss of privacy or significant overbearing impact in this case. Yet it is acknowledged that this southern elevation may have an enclosing effect upon the adjacent bungalow this would be so oppressive or overbearing to warrant refusal on this ground.

Visual Amenity and Character

The pair of semi-detached dwellings as stated above are unique within this street. They are prominent due to both their position and orientation within the street scene but also due to their 2-storey scale in this area which is predominantly bungalows. The pair are symmetrical and have attractive front gables, cat slide roofs and recessed porches. The proposed two-storey side extension will result in a form of development which would overly dominate the pair of semi-detached properties. The scale, design and form of the extension does not relate sympathetically to the host dwelling. The development detracts from the original character of the building and its aesthetically pleasing symmetry will be lost.

The nature of the roof form to the front side and rear elevations results in an incongruous form of development which is poorly related to the original character, scale and design of the host dwelling. The extension is not subservient to the host

dwelling; it results in a large bulk of development which would be prominently visible within the street scene to the front and side. The roofline of the extension when viewed from the south would appear significantly 'bulkier' than the existing dwelling owing to the taller ridge height and rear roof gable compared to the lower secondary ridge on the original subordinate rear projection. The impact upon the street scene and character and appearance of the existing dwelling would be that of significant harm. The extension will also fill the space up to the southern boundary. This will give rise to a cramped form of development in the street. There will be no spacing between the main bulk of the building and the boundary. This is therefore contrary to the Council's Development Control Standard No. 3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.' This states that "side extensions should be set back at least 1 m from the side boundary, this is particularly important in the case of two storey extensions." It also states the following: - "The most important basic principle is that any extension should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and street scene generally……In particular the proposal should not be allowed to over dominate the house or clash with its appearance."

The proposed extension is therefore unacceptable and is refused for the following reason: -

Recommendation

REFUSE

Due to its siting, size, 'bulk', form and design the proposed side extension would give rise to an unduly dominant and unsympathetic development that would be out of keeping with the scale and proportions of the existing dwelling, detracting from its appearance and the character of this semi-detached pair to the detriment of the surrounding street-scene. The proposed development would be therefore conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) and the NPPF.

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 11th October 2016

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 11.10.2016