Expiry Date - 31/12/2014

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1442/14 Recommendation – REFUSE

Site: 100A Grand Avenue Lancing West Sussex BN15 9QB

Proposal: Remodelling of existing bungalow with ground and first floor extension to provide annexe accommodation for dependent relative (re-submission following refusal of AWDM/0505/14).

Date of Site Visit: 2/5/14

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a detached, hipped-roof bungalow within a street of similar properties.

The application seeks consent for double hip to gable side roof extensions, two front gables and an L-shaped rear extension with a gable end up to the full ridge height of the dwelling and extending 7.3 metres rear of the existing rear elevation. The proposed extension's rearward roof would extend from the main dwelling lateral ridge over 10 metres. The proposed first-floor accommodation would consist of 5 bedrooms. The application is closely similar to the previous refused application and differs in that all but one north facing side window have been deleted and the front elevation will have two gables instead of dormers. The overall scale and bulk would be very similar.

Consultations

Lancing Parish Council: No objections.

Representations: No third party representations have been received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.2 Space Around New Dwellings and Flats and .3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Relevant Planning history

AWDM/0505/14 - Remodelling of existing bungalow with ground and first floor extension to provide annexe accommodation for dependent relative. Refused.

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 two front facing gables and hip-to-side gables will radically re-shape the dwelling and enlarge it to a significant degree. By reason of the substantial resultant size, bulk and scale of the finished building, it would be clearly visible within the street scene and would appear incongruous with its rear bulk clearly visible through the gaps between dwellings. Despite other dwellings in the locality having gable ends and other roof alterations, these other forms are not in themselves of such a scale as to appear unduly obtrusive and are largely of a scale appropriate for their host dwellings and settings.

The rear addition in particular will be exceptionally large and of substantial depth and scale and with its stark box formation shape, would be a significantly over-dominant projection and would represent a very poor form of design. The addition will appear overly large and markedly disproportionate in terms of the modest scale of what was a small bungalow and the relatively smaller neighbouring dwellings either side. It would be a strident and incongruous form of development obtrusively out of scale and character with the form of the dwellings in the locality including those that have been extended.

With regard to the agent's supporting statement, it is submitted as follows:

In paragraphs 1.2 1.4 and 3.1 it is claimed that the current application overcomes the reasons for refusal of the first application, i.e., that the proposal's frontage design now harmonises with the street scene; that the side window rearrangement and the form of the proposal address neighbour impact shortcomings. For the reasons set out in the analysis above, clearly this is not the case.

In paragraph 2.3, the gap between nos. 100A and no. 100C to the north is cited as significant but now that this dwelling to the north is in place, it unfortunately limits the scope for a similarly deep extension to 100A as a rearward projection as proposed even given it would be off the boundary, would nonetheless create a cavernous and poorly lit trough between the buildings and would despite absence of windows in the south of 100C create

an oppressive and unduly shaded impact for the purposes of the neighbour and indeed the occupiers of the application site dwelling.

In paragraphs 2.4 – 3.6 of the supporting statement, it is stated that the street scene would be better served by the gabled sides of the proposal than the current dwelling shape with its full sloping side hips. The plots between 99 and 100C Grand Avenue inclusive are not widely separated and by reason of the build allowed to the north of 100A, there is limited space in which to create further volume on any of the three neighbouring properties. Because of the hip to gable reshaping, however the proposal would result in an impression of congestion and cramped development on the plot and this run of dwellings whereas at present, the hipped sides of 100A serve to ease the physical relationship between these buildings. The proposal may even risk resulting in a terracing effect when viewed from further along Grand Avenue. This would clearly be of detriment to the street scene and would conflict with the guidance set out in paragraphs 1.5 – 2.9 of the Development Control Standard 2 in respect of the new build previously approved for the plot to the north and paragraphs 1.11 and 2.5 of Development Control Standard No.3 as pertaining to extensions to dwellings.

Residential amenity

The property to the north at no. 100c has a single storey rear extension and has no side facing windows but will still lose a significant amount of sunlight and daylight to its south side amenity and access way through the bulk and position of the proposed extension to 100A.

The property to the south at 100 will lose no significant sun light being south of 100A but the scale and position of the proposal would overwhelm it and present an unduly dominant, oppressive, enclosing and overpowering intrusion.

The supporting statement claims between paragraphs 3.7 and 3.15 (there is no paragraph 3.2) that there would be no impact on neighbouring amenity. It correctly affirms that the removal of side windows would prevent overlooking but is markedly dismissive over the impact the proposal would have on views from the neighbouring plots especially from points along their flanks which will undoubtedly be used frequently for the purposes of access and from their rear gardens. As set out in the foregoing, it is submitted by way of response that the proposed deep outrigger, albeit designed to align with those on the neighbouring rear elevations, will nonetheless result in an unduly crowded and overdeveloped effect and one that will lead to loss of daylight and sense of enclosure and loss of spaciousness to such a degree as to warrant refusal.

In conclusion, it is submitted that the proposed development fails to respect the spacing of the dwellings in the road, will thereby harm the street scene and will be unneighbourly.

REFUSE for the reason:-

The proposal is unacceptable in that the excessive size, form and position of the proposed front and rear first floor extensions fail to relate sympathetically to the appearance, character, design or scale of the existing bungalow. The development would detract from the character of the existing bungalow constituting a visually dominant and inappropriate form of development and that would cause unacceptable loss of light and outlook to the neighbouring property to the immediate north. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved policy AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan and the NPPF.

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority is willing to meet with the Applicant to discuss the best course of action and is also willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

Case officer: L Simmons Date: 17/12/14

Authorised by: J Morin Date: 22.12.2014