Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – REFUSE**
AWDM/1334/12

Site: **128A Brighton Road, Lancing**

Proposal: **Rear and side extension with a pitched roof to flat roof conversion**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is to raise the roof of the existing building to form a flat roof 3 storey building, together with the construction of flat roof single storey side and rear extensions with rear balcony atop, and replacement of existing external staircase to the western flank. The resultant building would measure (at max) 8.5 metres in height, 11.9 metres in length, and 9.6 metres in width

The application building is a reasonably modest detached two-storey building with a hipped roof. Its walls are rendered with quoin detailing. The property has been horizontally divided into two flats. In addition, a single storey annexe building exists to the building's eastern flank (this is not shown on the submitted drawings). This forms part of the ground floor flat. It is finished in external materials to match the main building.

The surrounding area is an outer residential suburb of Lancing, backing on to the Widewater Lagoon. There is a change in ground level across the site with the lagoon to the south set at a lower height than the building's street frontage.

Relevant site history
AWDM/0957/12
Rear and side single storey extension and rear roof extension
Withdrawn

Consultations
Lancing Parish Council: No objections

Adur and Worthing Councils: The Environmental Health officer: please impose precautionary contaminated land condition

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies
South East Plan (GOSE 2009): CC1, CC6, BE1

Saved Adur Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ comprising:Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle
Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Neighbour impact

The neighbours principally affected by this development are the ground floor flat occupier and those to either side (the extension is removed from the remainder).

Neighbours to west and east

Both these neighbouring buildings have some windows which look out onto the application site. However the principal outlook from their habitable rooms is either due south or north.

Therefore no unacceptable loss of privacy would arise from this development from the slender vertical windows in either flank, and overlooking from new rear and front fenestration would be oblique. The balcony balustrade would be revised to protrude further into the rear garden, but this would result in no greater overlooking than at present. Similarly, the external staircase to the western flank is a replacement of an existing one (although the agent has failed to show this on the drawings).

Also, because of the separation distance between both these buildings and the development itself, no unacceptable overbearing and overshadowing effect would result onto either neighbour.

Ground floor flat

The ground floor flat extends across the entirety of the ground floor of the main house and annexe building. Because of the change in site levels, the ground floor flat is set at a lower level than the rear garden serving the upper floor flat. Several of its rear habitable rooms are positioned directly below the upper floor flat’s garden terrace.

The development would result in a building of greater built form than at present. However the bulk of this is contained in the raising of the roof and the smaller ground floor extension, which are both physically removed from the habitable rooms of the ground floor flat. This means unacceptable overbearing and overshadowing effect onto this neighbour is avoided.

The situation to the windows directly below the garden terrace would be no worse than the present situation. These rooms experience very little privacy and outlook currently.

Visual impact

The application building is not unpleasantly proportioned, having retained its original form and shape and most of its features including quoins. In terms of its scale, it has a sympathetic relationship to the annexe building built alongside it. Both buildings have the appearance of a single development. The design detailing of the application building (its two-storey scale, hipped roof, render and quoin/window header detailing) resonates in other properties in the immediate street, so it contributes to the street's local distinctiveness (although it is acknowledged that some of the properties have been redeveloped in a variety of styles).

When viewed face-on from the street, the proposal would be of excessive bulk creating an ill-proportioned building with an unsympathetic 'elongated' appearance. It would appear a full three storey in height with a conspicuous flat roof. With such overpowering form and shape, the harmonious scaling of the application building and its single storey annexe building would be lost. This would be exacerbated by the building's visually awkward fenestration arrangement, which would accentuate the extended building's poor proportions.

Moreover the overt contemporary design to the upper floors (expressed in use of exterior materials and finishes and vertical windows), would be incongruous with the traditional design of the remainder of the building. The latter is outside the applicant's control (the ground floor and annexe being under separate ownership). The domestic style front entrance porch, quoin branding and window heads, and hipped concrete tiled roof of this part of the building are all to be retained. Such a mismatch of styles would further lessen the integration of the two elements of the same building.

As a result of the above, the development would be of a poorly integrated design and style, harming the street scene.

For these reasons, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the existing house and street scene contrary to saved Policy AH7 of the Adur Local Plan 2003 and the supplementary planning guidance on residential extensions. These policies aim to ensure that extensions are of good quality design and are of a scale and appearance that relates to the characteristics of the area and to existing and adjoining properties. In this respect, this saved LP Policy is consistent with policy in the National Planning Policy Framework that indicates that development should always seek to secure high quality design. This policy therefore carries substantial weight.

Contaminated land

The site is not contaminated so an informative would suffice to raise the applicant's awareness of this risk, in the event of approval.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the reason:

> The proposal, by reason of its poorly integrated design, use of materials and fenestration detail, would constitute a highly unsympathetic and ill-

proportioned form and scale of development that would relate poorly to the existing scale, form, and architectural detailing of the original building and the ground floor flat to the detriment of its appearance in the street scene. It would therefore conflict with the 'saved' policies of the Adur Local Plan (AG1, AH7), 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' and policies of the South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1).

Informative

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 via email. 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 for the refusal, approval has not been possible

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

Case Officer: Matthew Porter Date: 03-01- 2013

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 04-01-2013