expires
21.05.08

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0163/08 **Recommendation - REFUSE**

Site: **117 - 119 Sompting Road Lancing West Sussex BN15 9LG**

Proposal: **Two-storey rear extension**

The Application

The application relates to a proposed development at the rear of No's 117 & 119 Sompting Road, on the south-east corner of the junction between Sompting Road and Leconfield Road. The site lies within the built-up area of Sompting within a primarily residential area. The existing buildings at No's 117 & 119 are comprised of a convenience store at ground floor level across both properties, a one bedroom first floor flat at No.117 and a three bedroom maisonette above and to the rear of the shop section of No.119.

The proposal is to extend the existing east side property (No.119) with a two-storey rear extension which would be, 11.2m in length, by 6.5m in depth, by 6.2m in height. The proposed extension would serve as additional living space at ground floor level and three bedrooms and a master bedroom at first floor level. There would be an independent spiral staircase connecting the master bedroom with the proposed lounge.

To the north the road is generally characterised by chalet style bungalows, many of which have been extended or improved. To the west is a small painted render bungalow on the adjacent corner of Leconfield Road which is sited behind 1.2m high boundary wall. To the south is a terrace of five houses (No's 1-9 Leconfield Road), also painted render and to the east is a pair of Victorian red-brick semi-detached houses (No's 113 & 115).

Prior to the amalgamation of the two premises (117 & 119) into one larger convenience store, the eastern shop used to be an off-license and the western a smaller general store. When the two stores were separate No.117 had three different proposed developments refused for: a two-bedroom townhouse (with rooms in the roof) attached to the east side (L/31/01/TP); a two-bedroom townhouse with front dormer (amended scheme L/105/01/TP); and a one bedroom townhouse with front dormer attached to the east side (L/174/01/TP).

An application for the demolition of the rear conservatories and garage behind No's 117 & 119 and erection of an attached two-storey block of 4 one-bedroom apartments with 5 parking spaces including a new access to Leconfield Road was refused in 2007 (ADC/0567/07). The application was refused for the reason that: (1) the proposal would have constituted an undesirable intensification of residential development at a density which would have been out of keeping and incompatible with existing development in the locality; (2) the proposal would have given rise to an uneighbourly form of

development which would have been detrimental to the residential amenities and environment of the locality, resulting in loss of light, loss of privacy and an overbearing effect; (3) the proposal did not relate sympathetically in design, form and scale with the existing character of the locality ; and (4) there was no evidence that the necessary contribution would be made to improvements to sustainable transport.

Consultations and Representations

Director of Services: The Environmental Health Officer states that the two 'bedrooms' located within the corridor between the en-suite and the main bathroom are less that 50 sq ft floor area and so cannot be considered as sleeping accommodation. They state that the fire route are all through the kitchen and that they have concerns that a property of this size may result in it being used as a House of Multiple Occupation.

Third Parties : There have been three letters of objection to the proposals received.

The two co-owners of No.113 raise an objection to the amount of sunlight that will be taken away from their rear garden for a large part of the day, the lack of recreational space that would be left to the rear of the property, and that the proposal will only exacerbate an already bad parking situation.

The owners of No.119 feel that the development would be an over-intensive development, and that the proportion of garden being developed would be out of character, that no parking is indicated on the plans, that the garden length would be less than 11m long and under 100sqm, and that the development would result in loss of outlook from their rear bedroom.

Lancing Parish Council: No comments received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (WSCC 2005) (saved policies): LOC1, CH1, NE1-2, ERA1,DEV1, DEV3-5.
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH1-2, AH5, AT12 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.'
Revised West Sussex Parking Standards and Transport Contributions Methodology (WSCC 203 and ADC 2004)
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Structure Plan policies seek to protect, and where possible, enhance the character and distinctiveness of an area, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general.

The above Development Control Standard states, amongst other things that, two-storey extensions that are within 1.0m of a side boundary with an attached dwelling should normally be no deeper than 2.0m and that those which abut the boundary will not normally be permitted. It goes on to state that a garden length of 11.0m should usually be retained to prevent overlooking, loss of privacy and adequate garden area.

Development Control Standard No.2 'Space around new dwellings and flats' and No.4' Flat Conversions' are not directly applicable, however they give useful guidance about the sizes expected for rooms within new dwellings and minimum garden areas that are required. It states that single bedrooms should be at least 6.5 sqm, that the garden for a large dwelling such as this should be at least 100sqm.

Visual amenity

The proposed extension would occupy a great proportion of the existing rear garden and retain only a 0.9m gap to the southern boundary. The separation that currently exists between the rear of the properties in Sompting Road and the side of No.1 Leconfield Road would be permanently lost to the detriment of the character of the streetscene.

The size of the proposed extension would appear to overwhelm the existing building giving the site an overdeveloped appearance which would adversely affect the visual amenity of the area and the host dwelling.

The large featureless east side wall would appear overbearing and unneighbourly as seen from the gardens of properties to the east (No's 115 & 113)

Residential amenity

The garden area of No.117 is comprised of mainly hardstanding at the side of the retail premises and it is used for clothes drying bin storage and parking of cars. To the rear the garden is dominated by a large garage which appears to be used for a stock room for the shop with the rest of the garden being unmaintained. The garage is approximately 4.5m in height with a ridged roof and 5.0m wide, by 6.0m long. The upper flat has no useable outside amenity space of any significance.

The garden area left over for No.119 would be in excess of the minimum standard and therefore the resultant amenity space would be adequate for the size of home, However the length of garden to the rear of the proposed extension would not be sufficient to prevent overlooking or loss of privacy to the rear garden of No.1 Leconfield road. Two of the proposed bedrooms would be well under the minimum standard for a single bedroom at 4.4sqm, which is considered to be unacceptable.

The flat above No.117 has its own access and may be independently occupied, but it appears from the plans to be in the ownership of the applicant. Nevertheless the proposal would be built directly onto the boundary and would result in the outlook from the rear bedroom of this flat being purely of the blank east side wall and the existing garage at the rear of No.117, it would also lead to a significant amount of daylight which is considered to be unacceptable.

The proposed window serving the southernmost bedroom of the extension would have an outlook partially obscured by the side wall of No.1 Leconfield Road, otherwise it would have direct views into the rear garden of this adjacent house from a distance of 4.5m.

The windows in the west side elevation of the proposal would increase the level of overlooking of the bungalow on the west side of the junction (No.121) however due to the relatively low boundary wall it is felt this would not be to an unacceptable level.

Residential amenity
The property to the east No.115 is separated by a 2.0m high wall and the large detached garage to the rear of No.117, and it is considered that the outlook from the rear rooms would not be diminished to an extent that would warrant a refusal in this case.

The rear of No's 113 and 115 are both south facing and whilst the proposals may have a slight affect on levels of sunlight to the rear gardens of the adjacent properties it is felt that this would not be significant.

Access and Parking
The proposals allow for no additional on-site parking, but given that the extension is intended for use with the main dwelling and that parking is available in and around the site, which in itself is relatively sustainable in location, it is felt that parking levels would not be so affected to warrant a refusal on solely this basis.

Recommendation

REFUSE for reason that :-

1. H20R
   The proposed extension, by reason of its large size and unneighbourly design would be detrimental to the residential

amenities of the locality, resulting in loss of light, loss of privacy and an overbearing effect on adjoining property, contrary to the policies of the West Sussex Structure Plan (DEV1) and the Adur District Local Plan (AH7)

2. B2R amended
The proposed extension, by reason of its large size would be out of keeping in scale and appearance with the existing building and would detract to an unacceptable extent from the visual amenities and residential environment of the locality and thereby conflict with the policies of the approved West Sussex Structure Plan (CH1, DEV1) and the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7)

Case Officer: [illegible]
Date: 19/5/08

BB 20/5/08