Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/01447/13**

Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 21 Roman Crescent, Southwick

Proposal: Single storey first floor extension to east side

Date of site visit: 16 January 2014

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The site relates to a detached house located on the north side of Roman Crescent. The site is within the Southwick Conservation Area. The Conservation Area appraisal describes Roman Crescent as follows:

Roman Crescent is a more suburban style street, with a wider sweeping carriageway, footpaths on both side and a moderate amount of traffic and onstreet parking. The overall low density character is reinforced by the large plots with wide frontages and generous front and rear gardens. Buildings are set back from the street, allowing trees and vegetation to partially obscure the buildings

The house is not identified as a positive contributor in the conservation area.

Permission is sought for the construction of a first floor side extension over the existing side garage. The extension would be set back from the front of the side wing of the house by approximately 0.4 metres and similarly set in from the side wall of the garage. A pitched roof would wrap around the roof of the garage and a false pitch is proposed to the main roof of the extension up to 7.2 metres in height, retaining the existing chimney and set around half way up the side roofslope of the existing house. Windows are proposed to the front and rear and there are no side windows proposed.

Relevant site history
SW/40/94/TP/15535Single-Storey Rear Extension Approved 17.09.94

Consultations and Representations
None received

Relevant Planning Policies
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AB4, 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
Residential amenity
The main impact of the proposed extension would be to the occupiers of No.23 to the east. No. 23 is set back from the application dwelling and has been extended to the side with a single storey mono pitch extension. There is a window at the front of this serving a bathroom which is partially obscure glazed and there are rooflight windows along its side roofslope. Although the proposed extension would be sited forward of No.23, given the existing relationship with No.21, that there are no windows to habitable rooms immediately adjacent to the proposed extension and that the extension would be set in slightly from the side boundary, it is considered that there would be no significant harm caused to residential amenity in terms of loss of light or outlook. If approved, a condition can be attached to ensure no side windows are installed in the extension in the interests of protecting privacy.

Visual amenity
The existing house is generally L-shaped with a front projection with its bay window being the very front wall of the house and the side wing being stepped back from that. The proposed extension would be to the side of the existing side projection and would itself be set back from the front wall of this element. Due to the slightly staggered nature of the building line in Roman Crescent, when viewed from the west, the full extent of the extension would not be readily visible in the streetscene and would appear as a subservient addition to the house.

However, the view from the east is such that the extension would appear more prominently in the street with its side wall close to the boundary on this side. Development Control Standard No. 3 (DC3) sets standards for side extension where it states that:

'*Side extensions should be set back at least 1m from the side boundary. This is particularly important in the case of two-storey extensions since, if adjacent dwellings were both extended up to the side boundary, it would create a "terracing" effect which would destroy the existing character of the area. If the area is spacious in layout and the buildings are large, a space greater than 1m may well be necessary to avoid an appearance of overdevelopment and a cramped effect…'*

In this case, due to the staggered nature of the building line, the 'terracing' effect would not necessarily exist if the neighbouring dwelling to the east extended similarly towards the boundary, although a pinch point would be created between the rear of the proposed extension and the front of any side addition. As a result, the appearance would be significantly more cramped than existing and it should be noted that the low density character of Roman Crescent is particularly noted in the Conservation Area Appraisal. The character of Roman Crescent is generally quite spacious with front gardens, wide plots and spacing between buildings all contributing to this. The proposed extension, set in such close proximity to the boundary, would have a detrimental effect on this character, particularly given its siting forward of No.23 making it readily visible in the streetscene. It is noted that No. 19 to the west is sited in close proximity to the boundary, however this part of the building is a large veranda at first floor level with open sides and so despite its

close proximity to No.21, the spacious character of Roman Crescent is maintained with the main wall being set well back from the boundary.

DC3 goes on to state that

Side extensions being clearly visible from the road should be designed to closely match the existing dwelling. In particular they should have a roof in keeping with the existing dwelling which, in most cases, will mean a pitched roof. False mono-pitched facades are not acceptable on the front elevation only, they may occasionally be acceptable if they run around all sides of the extension…'

Although the design of the roof as a false pitch helps to reduce the scale of the extension and retain the chimney, its design is not ideal here, with its proportions differing from the main roof.

Given the position of the extension where it would be readily visible in the streetscene, particularly when viewed from the east, its design and proximity to the boundary, and relationship with No.23 to the east, the proposed extension would appear overly dominant, leading to a cramped appearance and harmful to the spacious character of Roman Crescent and would therefore not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Recommendation

Refuse for the reason:-

The proposed extension would, by reason of its design, position and close proximity to the boundary, result in a cramped and unsympathetic development, which would be harmful to the spacious character of the streetscene and as such would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Southwick Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to saved policies AB4 and AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan, Development Control Standard No. 3 and the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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: 13 February 2014

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 18 February 2014