Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0670/17 Recommendation – REFUSE

Site: 43 Tower Road, Lancing BN15 9JR

Proposal: Part single storey and part two storey rear extension and rooms in roof with rear dormer all to south elevation

Date of site visit: 18.05.2017

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to middle of terrace, two storey residential property situated on the south side of Tower Road, Lancing. The site has a fairly deep front garden of approx. 11.5 metres and a very deep rear garden of some 34.5 metres. Tower Road, predominately comprises two storey terraced housing. The site also backs onto railway lines. Lancing railway station lies to the east of the site.

The neighbouring properties have both undertaken rear conservatory extensions with no. 45's being constructed up to the boundary with the application site, no. 41's conservatory is built off the boundary by approx. 1metre.

Proposal

Permission is sought for extensions to the rear (south) of the dwelling comprising:-

Single storey ground floor, flat roof extension up to the boundary with both neighbouring properties, measuring some 6.3m wide x 5.5m deep x 3m high;

First floor hipped roof extension some 750mm from boundary with no. 45 and 2.35m from boundary with no. 41. The roofs ridge would come above the cill height of the proposed dormer windows. The eaves would be level with the existing dwelling and it would repeat the exposed cut foot rafters of the existing dwelling. The first floor extension would measure some 3.05m wide x 3m deep x 3.8m high from the top of the ground floor extension and some 6.8m from ground level.

Roof dormer flat roof dormer extension taking the full width of the roof measuring 6m wide x 2.8m deep x 2.7m high, leaving only some 100mm either end of the dormer from the boundary with each of the neighbours.

Consultations:

Environmental Health:

Potentially contaminated land, apply precautionary condition

Representations: 2 letters of objection from 41 and 45 Tower Road

- Ground floor 3m high which is above the fence by 1m and higher than our conservatory
- Overshadow our glass windows and conservatory roof

Lancing Parish Council : No objections

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Submission Adur Local Plan 2016: Policy 15
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extension which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The proposal comprises 3no. separate rear extensions 1no. ground floor; 1no. first floor; and 1no. on a newly created second floor.

The main purpose of the extensions are to upgrade the existing middle of terrace property by enlarging the kitchen on the ground floor; moving the bathroom from the ground to the first floor; and by providing an additional bedroom within the second floor.

There will be other internal work within the existing dwelling to modernise it, such as enlarging the internal front porch and provide a ground floor cloakroom under the stairs. One of the first floor bedrooms would have to be reduced in size in order to provide the stair extension to the second floor.

The internal layout is well thought through but for one matter, the external, physical extensions are considered to be exceedingly large on this modest, middle of terrace dwelling. The proportions of the ground floor would be unneighbourly by reason of its length and width combined.

The first floor design is more considered than the ground and roof extensions, and indeed has taken on some good design matters such as exposed cut foot rafters, but it is in the wrong position on the first floor and creates an unbalanced addition as it is set some 750mm from the west boundary and approx. 2.45m from the east boundary

Like the ground floor extension, the roof dormer is overly large for such a modest middle of terrace house. Its outside wall sits on the wall plate of the

existing dwelling; its width, on either side, is only some 100mm from the neighbouring properties; but its height is below the ridge of the existing dwelling by some 250mm. The depth and width of the dormer would need to be seriously reduced to have made the dormer more in proportion and not overly dominant within the roof.

The combination of all the extensions would create an overdevelopment of the existing dwelling and would result in an unneighbourly form of development by reason of overbearing.

The extension is located wholly at the rear and would have no impact on the street-scene.

Residential Amenity

Both neighbours have constructed rear extensions, no. 45 have constructed a glazed conservatory up to the boundary with the application site and being approx. 3.5m in depth. It also has an elaborate roof to a height of some 3.4m. By having glazing in its side elevation above the fence line with no. 43, it is considered to be unneighbourly, as it directly overlooks its neighbour. Having said this, it is now an existing structure, and will need to be taken into consideration in the determination of the current application at no. 43

No. 41's extension is more modest, being some 1.1m from the boundary and being of a length of approx. 3m

It is considered that the ground floor extension by reason of its depth and length would be overbearing onto its immediate neighbours.

Recommendation

REFUSE

1. By reason of its large size the proposed ground floor extension would have an unneigbourly impact on its immediate neighbours no. 's 41 and 45 Tower Road, Lancing. The proposed development is thereby contrary with saved policy AH7 of the Adur Local Plan; the Council's SPG Development Control Standard No. 3 'Alterations and Extensions to Dwellings' and policy 15 of the Submission Adur Local Plan 2016
2. Cumulatively, by reason of their large size, massing and design the proposed extensions would be poorly related in visual terms to the host dwelling, detracting from its modest scale and proportions and resulting in an overdeveloped appearance that would be out of keeping with the character of the area. The proposed development is thereby contrary to saved policy AH7 of the Adur Local Plan the Council's SPG 'Development Control Standard No.3 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' and policy 15 of the Submission Adur Local Plan 2016

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

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 20.06.2017

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 22.06.2017