Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0311/18 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 41 Nursery Close, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Detached two storey 2no. bedroom annexe to replace existing garage

Date of site visit: 17 April 2018

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application has been amended from a two storey extension to a detached two storey outbuilding. The application property is a single storey bungalow with a detached garage on its west side. The application proposes to demolish the garage and a short section of the existing bungalow to enable a detached two outbuilding to be constructed, to be used as an annexe to the bungalow.

The building will measure approximately 5.3m wide, 5.9m deep and 5.5m high. It will have a barn hipped roof at the front and rear. It will be project approximately 3.9m in front of the bungalow.

Relevant site history

None

Consultations

None

Representations

2 objections received to original plans from the occupiers of 26 Crown Road and 40 Nursery Close:

- Loss of light and privacy

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 building would not respect the form of the existing bungalow. It would be overtly two storey, with a higher eaves, and would be positioned forward of the front wall of the bungalow, increasing its prominence. The proposed first floor window only serves to highlight the two storey form of the building. Its gable fronted design is also at odds with that of the host bungalow and the other bungalows in the street.

Annexe buildings should be incidental and subsidiary to the original dwelling but in this case it would be on two floors within a prominent building of differing form to the host dwelling. It would effectively be a new house and would fail to respect the character of the site in terms of form, height and density, contrary to Policy 15 of the Local Plan.

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 so overlooking is also not anticipated.

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.

Recommendation

REFUSE, 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.

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: 15 June 2018

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 18 June 2018