Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/1253/15**

Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 5 Firle Road, Lancing

Proposal: Side extension with pitched roof; side extension at front adding gable to hipped roof

Date of site visit: 28-09-2015

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site relates to a detached dwellinghouse building in an outer residential suburb of Lancing. The site level drops significantly north-south; the building appears as a chalet bungalow when seen from the street, but is two-storey at the rear. The building has also been sizeably extended at the front with a pitched and gabled roof.

The proposal is for a:-

- pitched roof side extension (also to be built off the rear wall), to measure at max 5.5 metres in height, 6.1 metres in length, and 2.5 metres in width
- hip-to-gable roof extension at side, to measure at max 5 metres in height, 4.6 metres in length, and 3.4 metres in width
- New access steps to the side.

Relevant site history
None

Consultations
Lancing Parish Council: *No objections*
Southern Water: *Attached informative*

Representations
Objection received from occupier of 8 Firle Road Lancing:-
Gable end to front extension unbalances Front Elevation street scene and is very overbearing to adjoining property no. 3 Firle Road which has an eaves 2 metres lower than no. 5. Existing rear side accommodation is no more than outbuilding/shed. Proposed description is therefore inaccurate and should state rear side proposals are in fact extension providing habitable accommodation. Provision of pitched roof with gable end on boundary would be overbearing to adjacent property no. 3 and highly visible. If approved a flat roof would appear more than adequate and blend with existing extension flat

roof to rear. No mention of doubling size of basement room and should be noted to description.

Relevant Planning Policies
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
Saved Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 Extension and Alterations to dwellings

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Residential amenity

The neighbours principally impacted upon are those to the side and rear of the application site.

Neighbour to east, No. 3

The neighbour to the east is a bungalow set at a considerably lower height than the application property.

This drop in site level would make both extensions form a substantial amount of additional high wall close up to the shared boundary that would overbear onto the neighbour adversely. There would be a substantial feeling of enclosure and sense of overpowering encroachment, to the detriment of the outlook currently experienced by the neighbour.

The shadow cast by the extensions would be onto the side wall of the neighbouring bungalow so fenestration facing the shared boundary would also experience loss of daylight and sunlight (although the severity of this is reduced as the side windows are unlikely to serve as principal light sources to habitable rooms)

The proposal would therefore be in conflict with Saved Local Plan policy AH7, which requires proposals to be designed so as not to result in loss of natural light or have an overbearing effect. This is in line with the Core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks always to secure a good standard of amenity for all occupants.

There would no worse overlooking situation as windows/openings are not to be installed in the flanks of the side extensions, so unacceptable loss of privacy is avoided.

Neighbour at rear

Although there will be some greater propensity for overlooking, this would not be of an unacceptable nature. The proposed works are physically removed from this neighbour so negate adverse overbearing/overshadowing.

Visual amenity

5 Firle Road has been extended in the past, most prominently by way of a single-storey pitched roof front extension. However, the original dwelling building is still recognisable from street views.

The Council's adopted SPG relating to domestic extensions advises that front extensions are particularly difficult to incorporate successfully with the existing house and streetscene. Therefore, a high quality design standard would be expected of front extensions to avoid resultant harm.

The existing front extension could have been better integrated with the original dwelling. However this should not be reason to accept further additions to it that would compound the harm that has already occurred.

The resultant enlarged extension would extend beyond the width of the original dwelling house and its gabled flank would be highly prominent when viewed side on in the public street. From this view alone, the lack of integrated roof form means the extension would have the appearance of a visual oddity, competing as a stand-alone element to the original dwelling to the further detriment of its visual integrity.

The resultant harm visually that would occur is in conflict with Saved Local Plan policy AH7 which requires extensions to be of a design sympathetic to the both the original dwelling and the area in general, and the principles set out in the allied Supplementary Planning Guidance. Such a conclusion is compliant with paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Less visual harm would arise from the other side extension as this is set further back into the site where the land level drops. When viewed from both the front and side this would sufficiently subservient and visual integrated.

However, the visual harm described above that would arise from the forward most side extension is sufficient alone to warrant resisting the granting of planning permission.

Recommendation

REFUSE

For the following reasons:-

1. The proposal would, by reason of the scale and proximity of the facing flank elevations of both extensions to the neighbouring building to the east, adversely overbear onto neighbouring occupiers to the detriment of their residential amenities in conflict with Saved Adur Local Plan policy AH7(a) and the relevant Core Planning Principles of the National Planning Policy Framework

2. The proposal, by reason of the incongruous roof form and awkward shape of the forward most side extension, its prominence and lack of visual integration with the host dwelling, would diminish its architectural integrity giving rise to visual harm in the street scene to the detriment to

its appearance and character. As such it would conflict with Saved Adur Local Plan policy AH7(b) and paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework

Informative:

1. *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 via their appointed agent on the telephone. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to resolve those matters within the timescale allocated for the determination of this planning application. However, the Local Planning Authority has clearly set out, within its report, the steps necessary to remedy the harm identified within the reasons for refusal - which may lead to the submission of a more acceptable proposal in the future. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.*

2. *This refusal relates to the following plans:-*

Drawing No. HEP04/08/PRO/B titled Page 1 Location Plan date valid 16-08-2015
Drawing No. HEP04/08/PRO/B titled Page 2 Block Plan date valid 16-08-2015
Drawing No. HEP04/08/PRO/B tiled Page 5 Proposed Layout date valid 16-08-2015
Drawing No. HEP04/08/PRO/B titled Page 6 Proposed Elevations date valid 16-08-2015

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

Case Officer: Matthew Porter Date: 30-09-2015

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 1 October 2015