Expiry Date -

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/0561/12** **Recommendation – REFUSE**

Site: **33 Manor Road, Lancing**

Proposal: **Single-storey outbuilding onto First Avenue**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a detached single storey garage building to measure (at max) 4 metres in height, 4 metres in length, and 3.5 metres in width.

The application property is a semi-detached two-storey property with rendered walls.

The site is situated in an outer residential suburb of Lancing, just north of the A27. There is an absence of detached outbuildings forward of the line of dwellinghouse buildings in this street.

Relevant Planning History

None

Consultations

Lancing Parish Council: No objection

Adur & Worthing Councils: The **Environmental Health Officer** *requests precautionary contaminated land condition*

Representations

None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

South East Plan (GOSE 2009): BE1, CC1, CC6
Adur Local Plan: AG1, AH7

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle

Visual amenity

The application site has an unusual relationship to the street frontages of Manor Road and First Avenue. The property itself addresses Manor Road. However the new building would be positioned to the First Avenue street frontage.

The buildings in First Avenue have a regimented appearance that strongly defines the pleasing rhythm and spacious character of this street. This is to due to the set back of line of bungalows on its eastern side, but also the space between the buildings and the highway on its western side.

On both sides of the street these dwellings have been laid out to a strict building line which strongly defines the built form and there is also a noticeable absence of buildings or other structures between these dwellings and the highway. Views of the dwellings and their open front gardens make an important contribution to the character and appearance of the residential street.

The proposed building would breach this established building line by being positioned far forward of the line of bungalows on the eastern side. It would be erected immediately behind the front boundary fencing and comprises a fairly substantial building around 4 metres in height.

This structure would still be clearly seen behind any replacement fencing. Simply hiding the building in this way would be entirely the wrong approach in that it presents difficulties about ensuring that the screening is retained in perpetuity.

The fact that it extends so far forward of the applicant's house and the neighbouring property would make it stand out obtrusively. It would seriously harm the street scene and the character of this pleasing residential area.

The harm identified is most apparent in views looking north across the front gardens of the bungalows to the south at odds with its subservient function, notwithstanding garden planting. The garage also appears intrusive when seen looking south. Its partial hip roof form does not significantly reduce the visual impact of the garage from both these viewpoints.

Adding weight to the harm identified is its large size, awkward roof profile (not truly hipped or gabled), high level eaves exhibiting only a slight overhang, and roller shutter doors and lack of architectural detailing. Even in this area of some varied housing styles this would make it stand out even more incongruously with the traditional design of the bungalows to the south.

Its considerable bulk, overtly prominent forward location, and unsympathetic design, would all combine to give it an appearance at odds with the existing pattern of development, and the introduction of such a prominent building so far forward in the street frontage would have a harmful impact upon the rhythmic and spacious character of the street.

It is concluded the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such it would conflict with development plan policies in so far that

they require good quality design that causes no harm to the character and appearance of areas.

Given the main issue in this case relates to design and appearance of a modest development, the National Planning Policy Framework does not alter these conclusions.

Residential amenity

The building is physically removed from its neighbours to avoid harm arising onto their living conditions. The access is already there, so no greater noise and disturbance onto neighbours would result.

Contaminated Land

The site is not contaminated so 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 unduly prominent forward location, considerable bulk, and poor design, would constitute a highly unsympathetic and obtrusive form and scale of development that would be harmful to the established rhythmic and spacious character and appearance of the street. It would therefore conflict with the South East Plan policies BE1, CC1, CC6, and saved Adur Local Plan policies AG1 and AH7

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 by telephone and 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(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 20-2-2013

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 22 February 2013