Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/0430/15**

Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 1 Vincent Close, Lancing

Proposal: Removal of existing garage, erection of side extension and repitch roof with part hipped gables and front and rear dormers.

Date of site visit: 14 April 2015

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings
The application site relates to a detached bungalow located on the north side of Vincent Close with a modest garden to the front and rear. The bungalow, in common with others in this cul-de-sac has a hipped roof and it has a garage to the side. This is a predominantly residential area comprising mainly of mix of detached and semi-detached hipped roofed bungalows.

Permission is sought for the construction of a 2.46 metre wide side extension to replace the existing garage extending the full depth of the house and stepping forward of the main front wall by 0.45 metres. The roof would be extend over the new extension and a re-pitching of the roof is proposed to increase the ridge height to 6.35 metres to allow for additional accommodation within the roof space. Revised plans have been received also proposing a part gable/barn hip at each side. A hipped roof front dormer, set above the existing bay window, and rear dormer extension measuring approximately 8.5 metres in width, are proposed.

Relevant site history

None relevant at the application site.

No. 8 – AWDM/0989/14 - planning permission granted for single storey flat roof rear extension; 2 no. front dormers and hip to gable roof extension with rear dormer 29.08.2014

No. 31 - L/12/00/TP planning permission granted for rooms in roof (with part-hipped gable at side and rear dormer) 28.02.2000

Consultations
Lancing Parish Council – no comments received

Representations
Three representations received from neighbouring occupiers commenting with the following concerns:

- The extension is too large

- Loss of light
- Loss of privacy
- Loss of outlook
- Parking/congestion

Relevant Planning Policies
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved 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

The proposal comprises upgrading of 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 existing building is a modest hip-roofed bungalow property which is in keeping with the scale and form of the other 8 bungalows in the group forming the cul-de-sac which comprises detached and semi detached bungalows. It is considered that to increase the ridge height and form part gabled ends to the roof with dormer windows and extending to the side would have a harmful visual impact on both the property and the street scene.

The side extension would be sited close to the side boundary and with the new ridgeline following through over the extension at the increased height of 6.35 metres, 0.95 metres higher than the original ridge height. Part of the suburban character of the cul-de-sac is derived from the spaces between buildings and any perception of space that comes from the hipped roof design. Other bungalows within the cul-de-sac have hipped roofs which helps to maintain this reasonably spacious character, and although there is planning permission for a gable and dormers at No.8 this did not include any increase in roof height or a side extension and so a space of around 2 metres would be retained at the side boundary in this case. It is acknowledged that the semi-detached bungalows have a slightly higher (around 0.2 metres) ridgeline than the detached bungalows in the cul-de-sac, the difference in height between the neighbouring bungalow at No.2 and the application bungalow would be apparent particularly due to the close proximity of the two buildings. The combination of the part gables proposed and side extension with a higher ridge line than neighbouring bungalows would result in a more prominent building which would not sit comfortably within the streetscene, giving a more close-knit appearance in relation to neighbouring bungalows.

While it is acknowledged that there are other visible examples of gable extensions and dormers in the vicinity and that a hip to part gable to the original dwelling could be carried out as permitted development, such alterations, while still having a significant visual impact, would not cause as

much harm as if they were carried out in conjunction with the proposed side extension and raised ridge.

As originally proposed the application included a full gable at each side but following concerns raised over its appearance and bulk, the applicant has revised the proposals to include a barn-hip to the gable. A single dormer is now proposed on the front elevation (two were proposed originally) and a rear dormer extension which would measure 8.5 metres in width and 2.1 metres in height, set 0.9 metres below the ridge and set 1 metre back from the eaves. Although the revised proposals have reduced some of bulk and height when compared with the original scheme, the effect of the side extension, 0.95 metre increase in ridge height, and part gable wall would still be harmful to the character of the streetscene due to the dominance of the resultant building. Furthermore, despite the applicants efforts to reduce bulk, the remaining single front dormer window, whilst less bulky than the original proposals, would appear awkward in its isolated position in the roof slope. The rear dormer window appears excessively large spanning across the original building and the extended part and would dominate the rear roof slope, giving a top heavy appearance to the building which would be harmful to the recipient building and area in general.

Residential amenity
To the east, No.33 and 35 Elms Drive is a pair of semi-detached bungalows which back onto the side wall of the application site. Both have been modestly extended at the rear and so rear windows are within around 10 metres of the side boundary of the application site. The proposed side extension would bring the dwelling to 0.4 metres from the side boundary. The effect of the part gable and increase in ridge height, and with additional bulk from the rear dormer which would span across the extended part of the house, would be unneighbourly and overbearing, resulting in a significant increased sense of enclosure to the occupiers of No.33 and 35.

On the opposite side No. 2 to the west has a lean-to addition forming a utility room on the side elevation close to the boundary with the application site and has a side window serving a bathroom and so there are no windows to habitable rooms directly affected by the proposed extensions. However the increase in roof height, side gable and rear dormer would be readily visible from the rear garden of No.2. The size of this rear garden is limited, measuring 7 metres in depth and so given the proximity of the extensions to even the farthest point in the garden, there would be an increased sense of enclosure resulting from the increase in bulk and height of the roof additions.

To the north and south neighbouring dwellings are sufficiently separated so as not to suffer any significant impact from the proposals.

Recommendation

Refuse

The proposed re-pitching of the roof including raising of the ridge height, the proposed side extension and roof extensions would, by reason of their scale, dominance and design, relate poorly to the character of the cul-de-sac and general spacing between buildings and be detrimental to the visual amenities

of the locality. If permitted, the Local Planning Authority would find it difficult to resist similar proposals related to the other bungalows in the vicinity of the site, the cumulative effect of which would be to spoil the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, having regard to the close proximity of neighbouring bungalows, the proposed re-pitching and increase in ridge height and the introduction of gable walls would represent an unneighbourly and overbearing form of development, harmful to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, notably in terms of increased sense of enclosure to those occupiers. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies AG1 and AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan and advice in Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

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. 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.

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

Case Officer: Rebekah Smith Date: 26 May 2015

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 26.05.2015