Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/1141/12** **Recommendation – REFUSE**

Site: **117 Greenways Crescent, Shoreham-By-Sea**

Proposal: **Demolition of existing bungalow/garage/greenhouse, erection of 2 storey replacement dwelling and single storey garage**

Date of site visit: 1 October

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of existing bungalow/garage/greenhouse, erection of 2 storey replacement dwelling and single storey garage.

The site is on the northern side of Greenways Crescent on the corner with the junction to Ashlings Way an unmade road which rises steadily to the north where it meets Downside.

Although overall Greenways Crescent is of mixed character, the immediate environs of the application site are mainly bungalows or chalet bungalows some of which have flat roofed dormers in either their front or rear roofslopes. The immediate neighbours to the west of the site, which would be most affected by any proposal are all examples of such properties

Downside to the rear has a similar mix of properties but due to the rising ground they are higher than the application site. By the same token, properties on the southern side of Greenways Crescent are lower and there are some good long distance views from the vicinity of the application site.

Relevant site history

There is no planning history considered directly relevant to the application.

Consultations

West Sussex County Council: The County Council as highways authority do not anticipate any highway safety concerns arising out of the proposal.

Southern Water: Southern Water request an informative to any planning permission giving notice that a formal application to the public sewerage system is required in order to service the development.

Environmental Health: No objection but an informative would be required advising the developer that they would need to apply to Environmental Health for a Demolition Notice prior to any such demolition taking place. The precautionary land contamination condition is requested.

Representations

7 letters of objection have been received on the following grounds:

- the building is out of character with the area
- overbearing design
- loss of light and privacy
- overdevelopment of the plot
- far larger than the existing property
- does not reflect building line in the area
- loss of amenity
- does not comply with National Planning Policy Framework or Adur Local Plan requirements
- adverse impact upon highway safety
- increase noise, disturbance, traffic and smells

1 letter of comment has been received stating that the following issues need to be addressed before any permission is granted:

- the existing bungalow and garage both have asbestos
- trees have been cut down at the site and the property allowed to deteriorate
- hours of work should comply with Building Regulations requirement

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’
South East Plan (GOSE 2009): CC1, CC6, BE1
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The application site is within the defined built-up area and as such there is no objection in principle to the demolition and replacement of the existing dwelling.

Amenity

The key issues in respect of the application are the effect upon the visual character of the area and the amenities of neighbouring properties.

The immediate area is characterised by bungalows some of which have dormers in the roof, largely constructed under permitted development rights.

The properties to the northern side of Greenways Crescent have generous rear garden plots but due to the nature of the bungalows few of those properties extend back especially as far, including the immediate neighbour to the west. The existing dwelling on the site does extend further back than the neighbours due to a flat roofed single storey extension that was seemingly constructed under permitted development rights. In general, though, properties in the area are modestly sized.

While the proposed dwelling is more or less on the footprint of the existing (though projecting slightly further forward) by virtue of its 2 storey nature, it would be significantly larger in scale than those surrounding properties. This would have an adverse impact upon both the street scene and neighbouring properties.

In terms of the street scene, the existing dwelling is prominent due to its corner location with Ashlings Way and the lack of vegetation on its boundaries. The development would therefore be fully visible in the street and its 2 storey nature would contrast markedly with the chalet bungalows around it. Moreover the depth of the extension, effectively resulting in an additional floor when compared to the already unusually long rear single storey extension would increase the impact of the proposal when viewed from the open east aspect.

The depth of the proposed replacement extension also causes an unacceptable impact upon the adjoining property to the west, while the roof is at its lowest point closest to the boundary, there would still be an effective 2 storey projection of about 8 metres in depth which is considered to result in unacceptable impact upon the adjoining property.

A replacement garage is also proposed at the northern end of the site. While not unacceptable in itself, together with the unacceptable 2 storey elements of the propose house, it is felt it will further lead to the perception of overdevelopment on the site.

In conclusion, while some form of replacement dwelling may be acceptable on this site, it would need to be of a far lesser scale than is currently proposed. Accordingly, it is considered that the application should be refused.

Accessibility and parking

While some residents have raised concerns regarding increased traffic and highway safety issues, the County Council as Highways Authority have not objected to the application and therefore it is not considered an objection could be substantiated on this basis.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the following reason:-

The proposed replacement dwelling by virtue of its size, scale, height and design would be unduly dominant in the street scene and thus fail to reflect the character of surrounding development therefore adversely affecting the visual character of the area and in addition to the above factors, by virtue of

its depth to the rear would also adversely affect the amenities of neighbouring properties. The proposal therefore fails to comply guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and saved policies AH2 and AH7 of the Adur Local Plan 1996.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation?

Case Officer: Gary Peck Date: 15 November 2012

Authorised by: James Appleton Date: 16 November 2012