Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0313/19 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 41 Nursery Close, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and shed and construction of two storey 2no. bedroom extension to form annexe. (Amended re-submission of AWDM/0311/18)

Date of site visit: 17 April 2018

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is a single storey bungalow with a detached garage on its west side. The application proposes to demolish the garage and to construct a two storey side extension, to be used as an annexe to the bungalow.

The extension will measure approximately 5.4m wide, 5.9m deep and 4.9m high. It will have a gable at the front and rear with a first floor window within the front gable. It will have a lower ridge than the highest part of the existing bungalow and will have the same eaves height. It will project approximately 4m in front of the bungalow. It will be linked to the existing bungalow via a proposed internal door at ground floor.

Relevant site history

AWDM/0311/18 - Detached two storey 2no. bedroom annexe to replace existing garage- refused for the following reason:

The proposed building, by reason of its height, form and position forward of the front wall of the existing bungalow, would not respect the character of the existing building and would be a prominent addition, harmful to the street scene of Nursery Close. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Consultations

None

Representations

Letter of objection received from the occupier of 26 Crown Road:

- Still object for the same reasons as before
- Loss of light
- Loss of privacy
- Close to neighbouring property
- Plans are inaccurate as insufficient head height exists
- No measurements on plans to be able to judge impact

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 (March 2012)

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 would not be higher than the highest roof of the existing bungalow while the front gable would be similar to an existing gable on the building, albeit larger and wider. While there would be a first floor window it would not be overtly two storey as the eaves height would match those on the existing building.

However, it would be positioned forward of the front wall of the bungalow, increasing its prominence, although it would not come further forward than the front wall of 26 Crown Road to the west. Nevertheless, the projection forward of by 4m would increase the prominence of the building, particularly as the ridge of the extension would be higher than that of the part of the bungalow to which it would be attached. The advice in DM Standard No. 2 is that:

"*In the case of semi-detached or detached dwellings, front extensions will only be allowed where the extension can be successfully assimilated into the streetscene and not unduly affect neighbours*."

In this case, the extension would be overly prominent and would not assimilate successfully into the street scene.

Residential amenity

To the west, 26 Crown Road is a bungalow, the side of which faces the site. It has a blank side wall and is separated from the site by an electricity

substation. The building will not project as far to the rear as the existing garage and it is not considered that there will be an adverse impact on the occupiers of 26 Crown Road.

At the rear, 40 Nursery Close, is not positioned directly in line with the proposed building and is not expected to lose any light or outlook as a result of this proposal. No windows are proposed in the rear elevation to prevent overlooking.

The floor area of the proposed building is approximately 70 m2 which meets the national standard for a 2 bed 2 storey 3 person dwelling. Internally, a first floor to ceiling height of 2.2m will be achieved by lowering the ground floor level by 400mm. Minimum floor areas for single bedrooms with a headroom above 1.5m can be achieved.

However, there is concern that the addition of a two storey, two bedroom annexe to this existing 2 bedroom property would result in an over-intensive of use of the site. The rear garden would measure approximately 66sqm which is significantly less than the 100sqm required by DM Standard No.1 for 4 bedroom dwellings.

Recommendation

REFUSE, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed building, by reason of its height and position forward of the front wall of the existing bungalow, would be a prominent addition, harmful to the street scene of Nursery Close. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The construction of a two storey, two bedroom annexe extension to the existing bungalow would result in an over-intensive use of the site and would leave the property as extended with an inadequately sized rear garden for a family home of this size harmful to the occupiers' living conditions. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, Development Management Standard No. 1 'Space Around New Dwellings and Flats' and the relevant paragraphs of 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 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: Peter Barnett Date: 7 May 2019
Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 7 May 2019