Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0213/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 102 Connaught Avenue Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5WP

Proposal: Single-storey rear extension to east elevation with enlargement of existing roof from side hips to gables to provide rooms in the roof with rear dormer to east elevation and two front dormers and two rooflights to west elevation (re-submission of AWDM/1654/15).

Date of site visit: 26.11.2014 (AWDM/1654/15)

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a modest, detached, hipped-roof bungalow dating from the mid-C20 occupying a wedge-shaped plot on an inner bend on the east side of Connaught Avenue.

To the north the adjoining property, No.104, comprises one half of a pair of grade II Listed thatched cottages located within the Old Shoreham Conservation Area.

To the south, No.100 comprises a detached 2-storey house dating from the mid-C20, enlarged on the north side by an unsympathetic 2-storey side extension with a part pitched/part flat-roof (permitted in the late 1970s).

[A former front garden wall, concrete hard-standing and garage attached to the north side of the bungalow have all been demolished and a foundation trench dug to the rear of the bungalow.]

Proposal

Permission is sought for a single-storey rear extension 3m deep across the full width of the rear elevation (10.6m) plus replacement garage attached to the north side with utility room behind angled inwards to follow the alignment of the boundary on this side. In addition it is proposed to create rooms in the roof with hip to side gables, and front and rear dormers. The proposed rear box dormer would be positioned 0.5m below the ridge; it would be 1.7m high, 2.7m deep and 9.2m wide, set in from the edges of the enlarged roof by a minimum 1m. The proposed 2 front flat-roofed dormers would be centred above the existing double bay windows, each 1.55m high, 2.4m deep and 2m wide. Two roof lights are also proposed on the front roof slope.

The application has been publicised as affecting the setting of the neighbouring listed building and conservation area.

Relevant Planning History:

An application for a rear extension with enlargement of existing roof to provide rooms in the roof including rear dormer to east elevation and two front dormers and two rooflights to west elevation was refused in January this year (AWDM/1654/15 refers) on the following ground:

"By reason of its size, form, massing and poor design the proposed development would detract from the scale and proportions of the existing modest bungalow, appearing as a prominent and unsympathetic development that would detract from the street scene and be harmful to the setting of the adjoining Listed Building and the setting of the Old Shoreham Conservation Area. The development is therefore contrary to saved policies AB11 and AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan and the NPPF."

Consultations:

ADCAG: No comments received, but objected to previous application commenting that whilst members support the principle of enlarging a property it was felt the design was poor resulting in an unattractive building.

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AB11, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012).
NPPG

Planning Assessment

Principle

There is no objection in principle to the proposed development which involves enlarging an existing dwelling. The key considerations are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality and on the setting of the adjoining listed thatched cottage and the Old Shoreham Conservation Area.

Visual amenity

Saved policy AH7 expects extensions to be designed to be sympathetic to the original dwelling and the area in general, to not take-up an excessive proportion of the garden and not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, loss of natural light or overbearing effect.

The existing bungalow is modest in scale having a hipped roof with a short north-south ridge. Along its length the road is made up of a broad mix of

dwelling types, including 2-storey detached houses, detached bungalows and chalets, plus semi-detached and terraced houses. A number have been altered and enlarged by extensions, including box dormers.

In refusing the previous application it was considered the size and massing of the proposed roof extension would substantially alter the scale of the existing bungalow detracting from its appearance and balanced proportions, resulting in an unattractive form that would be conspicuously prominent and harmful to the street scene.

The main difference to the earlier refused scheme is the omission of the part pitched, part-flat rear roof extension and an associated reduction in the overall 'bulk' of the development. The proposed full side gables will undoubtedly alter the form and appearance of the bungalow, but not to the extent that its original scale and proportions will be overwhelmed. It is pertinent, bearing in mind the property is not located within the Conservation Area, that a similar form of roof enlargement could be undertaken as 'permitted development'.

The proposed rear dormer although very wide (in fact wider than that previously proposed) would be set-in by 1m from the sides of the gabled roof and would not be a dominant feature in public view. Although the flat-roofed form of the proposed front dormers is not particularly attractive, they are relatively small in size and balanced in relation to the enlarged front roof slope.

There is no objection to the proposed side and rear extensions which are subservient in form and in-keeping with the scale of this detached bungalow. The parapet roof design and timber garage door are sensitive to the traditional character of the bungalow and its environs.

Effect on the setting of the adjoining Listed Building and Old Shoreham Conservation Area

Saved policy AB11 states that new development adversely affecting the setting of a listed building will not be permitted. Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset *or development within its setting*.

Having regard to its diminutive scale and hipped roof form, the existing bungalow sits comfortably in the street scene without crowding the adjoining, grade II listed thatched cottage which is of a similarly modest scale. On the north side the proposed roof gable will extend the main 'bulk' of the roof to within approximately 3m of the site boundary with the listed cottage, No.104.

There is a separation distance of some 7-8 metres between the south side of the thatched cottage and the common site boundary, with a detached, clay-tiled, hipped-roof garage building within the curtilage of the listed building located close to the boundary. The enlarged 'bulk' of the elongated roof form would diminish the existing sense of spaciousness between the bungalow and the listed cottage, but in view of the separation distance between them it

would be difficult to argue that the reduced scale of the current proposals would be significantly intrusive or harmful to the setting of the listed building.

Old Shoreham dates from pre-Roman times and the Conservation Area includes the grade I Church of St Nicolas (founded before the Norman Conquest and rebuilt during the C12), and a number of listed buildings dating from the 16th and 17th Century in the vicinity, as well as the grade II* Tollbridge (c.1781) over the River Adur linking Old Shoreham with Lancing.

There is a marked grouping of listed buildings at the north end of Connaught Avenue (including Nos:104-106 and No:108-110) and nearby Tudor Cottage (457 Upper Shoreham Road). However, suburban development has taken place incrementally throughout the C20 infilling the spaces between the historic buildings from which the Conservation Area derives its historic character and leaving it sensitive to harm from unsympathetic development of a modern domestic scale. Although the application property is not located within the Conservation Area, it contributes to the setting of a key building which underpins the historic significance of the Conservation Area. Compared to the previously refused proposals, it is considered the reduced scale and massing of the gabled roof extension would not significantly impact on the setting of the Conservation Area.

Residential amenity

The properties most affected are No. 104 and 106a Connaught Avenue. The latter comprises a modern chalet-style house occupying a ‘backland’ situation to the rear of Nos:104-106.

In view of its orientation to the south of No.104, the increased ‘bulk’ of the side gable in proximity to the common boundary would have some impact on the amenity of the small garden area of that property in terms of overshadowing and an increased sense of enclosure, but the effect would be notably less than that arising from the earlier proposal.

Owing to the wedge-shape of the plot which tapers to the rear (east), the proposed rear dormer will facilitate views towards the west side garden of No.106a Connaught Avenue which at present is relatively private. However, this latest proposed increases the separation distance between the windows in the rear dormer and the nearest southwest corner of No.106a by some 2 metres. As before, the effect on the amenities of the occupiers of No.106a is not considered to warrant refusal in this suburban environment where an element of inter-visibility between neighbouring buildings is inevitable.

To the south, No.100 is sited slightly forward of No.102 and at an oblique angle. It has been enlarged by a 2-storey side extension on the north side extending close to the common boundary. There are no windows or other openings in the north side of this extension and having regard to the orientation of this property to the south of the proposed development, it is considered there would be no adverse effects on outlook, daylight/sunlight or privacy.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Matching materials
4. No windows in side walls of extension or roof gables
5. No use of flat roof as balcony or access thereto from rear dormer

Informative

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 06.04.2016

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 6 April 2016