Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1654/15 **Recommendation – REFUSE**

Site: **102 Connaught Avenue Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5WP**

Proposal: **Rear extension with enlargement of existing roof to provide rooms in the roof including rear dormer to east elevation and two front dormers and two rooflights to west elevation.**

Date of site visit: 26.11.2014

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: Y – Corrected Description

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a modest, detached, hipped-roof bungalow dating from the mid-C20 occupying a wedge-shaped plot on an inner bend on the east side of Connaught Avenue. At the time of the officer site visit the former front garden wall, concrete hard-standing and garage attached to the north side of the bungalow had been demolished and a foundation trench dug to the rear of the bungalow.

To the north the adjoining property, No.104, comprises one half of a pair of grade II Listed thatched cottages located within the Old Shoreham Conservation Area.

To the south, No.100 comprises a detached 2-storey house dating from the mid-C20, enlarged on the north side by an unsympathetic 2-storey side extension with a part pitched/part flat-roof (permitted in the late 1970s).

Proposal

Permission is sought to enlarge the bungalow by extending it 3 metres to the rear, including the roof to create a central area of flat roof, together with hip-to-side gables and front and rear dormers.

The proposed rear box dormer would be positioned 0.5m below the ridge; it would be 1.55m high, 2.4m deep and 7.8m wide, set in from the edges of the enlarged roof by a minimum 1.5m. The proposed 2 front flat-roofed dormers would be centred above the existing double bay windows, each 1.55m high, 2.4m deep and 2m wide. Two roof lights are also proposed on the front roof slope.

The submitted drawings show the former attached garage retained and the area to the rear of it infilled by a single-storey flat-roofed extension angled inwards to follow the alignment of the northern site boundary.

The enlarged accommodation would consist of an entrance hall, lounge, kitchen/dining/family room, WC, and guest suite with en-suite bathroom on the ground-floor, with 4 bedrooms (one with en-suite bathroom and dressing room) plus family bathroom on the first-floor.

The application has been publicised as affecting the setting of the neighbouring listed building and conservation area.

Relevant Planning History: None

Consultations:

ADCAG: Object. Whilst members support the principle of enlarging a property it was felt the design was poor resulting in an unattractive building.

Representations:

One letter of objection has been received from the occupier of 104 Connaught Avenue commenting that the proposed extensions would be visible from the curtilage of the listed cottage and would be totally out of character. The extensions would be too high, blocking out light. The neighbour comments that it is important to have light on the flint stone cottage due to the nature of the building. The proposal will look out of place, spoiling the aesthetics of the garden. There is concern that digging of foundations will have already damaged trees and shrubs growing close to the common boundary.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AB11, AH7 and Appendix 11 ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012).
NPPG

Planning Assessment

Principle

There is no objection in principle to the proposed development which involves enlarging an existing dwelling. The key considerations are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality and on the setting of the adjoining listed thatched cottage and the Old Shoreham Conservation Area.

Visual amenity

Saved policy AH7 expects extensions to be designed to be sympathetic to the original dwelling and the area in general, to not take-up an excessive proportion of the garden and not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, loss of natural light or overbearing effect.

The existing bungalow is modest in scale having a hipped roof with a short north-south ridge. Along its length the road is made up of a broad mix of

dwelling types, including 2-storey detached houses, detached bungalows and chalets, plus semi-detached and terraced houses. A number have been altered and enlarged by extensions, including box dormers. However, the proposed rear extension would substantially modify the form of the existing bungalow significantly altering its appearance and existing pleasing proportions to create a gabled, part-pitched part flat roof. Owing to the position of this property on a bend in the road, the enlarged 'bulk' and unattractive form of the roof would be conspicuously prominent in side views from both the north and south and would be harmful to the street scene.

The existence of a similarly unattractive part pitched part flat-roofed addition to the neighbouring 2-storey house does not establish a precedent for further unsatisfactory development.

The proposed rear dormer, although relatively wide, would be set-in from the sides of the gabled roof and would not be a dominant feature in public view. Although the flat-roofed form of the proposed front dormers is not particularly attractive, they are relatively small in size and balanced in relation to the enlarged front roof slope.

Effect on the setting of the adjoining Listed Building and Old Shoreham Conservation Area

Saved policy AB11 states that new development adversely affecting the setting of a listed building will not be permitted. Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset ***or development within its setting***.

Having regard to its diminutive scale and hipped roof form, the existing bungalow sits comfortably in the street scene without crowding the adjoining, grade II listed thatched cottage which is of a similarly modest scale. The gabled roof enlargement would substantially alter the scale of the existing bungalow, extending it to within approximately 1m of the northern site boundary with No.104.

There is a separation distance of some 7-8 metres between the south side of the thatched cottage and the common site boundary, with a detached, clay-tiled, hipped-roof garage building within the curtilage of the listed building located close to the boundary. Nevertheless the additional 'bulk' and elongated gabled form of the enlarged roof would be prominently visible above the garage roof and intrude into the setting of the listed building, in a way in which the original bungalow was clearly designed to avoid.

Old Shoreham dates from pre-Roman times and the Conservation Area includes the grade I Church of St Nicolas (founded before the Norman Conquest and rebuilt during the C12), and a number of listed buildings dating from the 16th and 17th Century in the vicinity, as well as the grade II* Tollbridge (c.1781) over the River Adur linking Old Shoreham with Lancing.

There is a marked grouping of listed buildings at the north end of Connaught Avenue (including Nos:104-106 and No:108-110) and nearby Tudor Cottage (457 Upper Shoreham Road). However, suburban development has taken place incrementally throughout the C20 infilling the spaces between the historic buildings from which the Conservation Area derives its historic character and leaving it sensitive to harm from unsympathetic development of a modern domestic scale. Although the application property is not located within the Conservation Area, it nevertheless contributes to the setting of one of the key buildings which underpins the historic significance of the Conservation Area. The scale and massing of the proposed development is wholly insensitive to this important historic context and in consequence would be harmful to the setting of the Conservation Area.

Residential amenity

The properties most affected are No. 104 and 106a Connaught Avenue. The latter comprises a modern chalet-style house occupying a 'backland' situation to the rear of Nos:104-106.

In view of its orientation to the south, the increased 'bulk' of the gabled roof extension in proximity to the boundary with No.104 would have some impact on the amenity of the small garden area of that property in terms of overshadowing and an increased sense of enclosure, but the effect on the accommodation of the building itself would be less apparent owing to the presence of the detached garage building sited between the south side of the dwelling and the common boundary. Harm caused to the neighbour's shrubs and vegetation by cutting back of roots encroaching under the site boundary is essentially a private matter.

Owing to the wedge-shape of the plot, the proposed rear dormer will facilitate views towards the west side garden of No.106a Connaught Avenue which at present is relatively private. However, some degree of inter-visibility is inevitable within a suburban environment such as this, and the effect of overlooking would not be so severe as to warrant refusal on this ground.

To the south, No.100 is sited slightly forward of No.102 and at an oblique angle. It has been enlarged by a 2-storey side extension on the north side extending close to the common boundary. There are no windows or other openings in the north side of this extension and having regard to the orientation of this property to the south of the proposed development, it is considered there would be no adverse effects on outlook, daylight/sunlight or privacy.

Recommendation

REFUSE

By reason of its size, form, massing and poor design the proposed development would detract from the scale and proportions of the existing modest bungalow, appearing as a prominent and unsympathetic development that would detract from the street scene and be harmful to the setting of the adjoining Listed Building and the setting of the Old Shoreham Conservation

Area. The development is therefore contrary to saved policies AB11 and AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan and the NPPF.

Informative

1. Refused – No Discussion

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 31 December 2015

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 4 January 2016