Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1081/17 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 2 Seaside Road, Lancing

Proposal: Two storey extension to south elevation (re-submission of AWDM/1298/16)

Date of site visit: 13.09.16 – when considering original submission AWDM/1298/16

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: Y – 14 days

Site, Surroundings and Proposal

The application site is a two storey semi-detached dwelling within the built up area of Lancing. The dwelling fronts onto Seaside Road positioned on the eastern side. Seaside Avenue runs to the south of the site. The immediate adjacent area comprises mainly of semi-detached or detached bungalows, with a two storey building to the south. In general, the pair of semi-detached properties no.2 and no. 4 Seaside Road are matching in form, design and appearance. They represent a prominent pair due to their unique form and character within this vicinity. They have a prominent matching front gable with cat slide roof which combined with their recessed porches are attractive symmetrical features. The property is sited almost as a corner plot with the front elevation of the pair clearly visible both within Seaside Road and on the approach from the east on Seaside Avenue. The southern side elevation of no. 2 is also clearly visible from Seaside Avenue.

Consent was refused in October 2016 for a two storey side extension to the southern side of no.2. The extension was shown to be slightly set back from the gabled front elevation of the dwelling and ran along the same depth as the existing dwelling. The existing detached, single, pitched roof garage to the side was to be demolished to allow for the development.

The extension was to be 3.1 metres wide, the height matching that of the main ridge, reducing slightly to the rear. The roof form was to be significantly altered to enlarge the existing rear gable, two storey projection to be encompassed within the new enlarged side gable. The height of the rear section of roof was to be increased from 6.7 metres high to 8.1 metres. This extension provided a garage and playroom at ground floor and a master bedroom, dressing room and en-suite at first floor.

This application was refused for the following reason: -

Due to its siting, size, 'bulk', form and design the proposed side extension would give rise to an unduly dominant and unsympathetic development that would be out of keeping with the scale and proportions of the existing dwelling, detracting from its appearance and the character of this semi-detached pair to the detriment of the

surrounding street-scene. The proposed development would be therefore conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) and the NPPF.

The current application seeks consent for a scaled down version of the previously refused scheme. The proposal shows a more subservient two storey addition to the side of the dwelling set down lower than the existing ridge height with a hipped roof. The depth of the two storey section has also been significantly reduced, amended plans have also been received to reduce this further to represent the depth of the original dwelling at first floor. The ground floor is deeper with sloping pitched roofs to front and rear. The extension provides a garage and playroom at ground floor and a fourth bedroom at first floor. The amended plans also show two first floor windows on the side elevation. Officers recommended this to break up the dominant impact of this side elevation which will be very visible within the street scene. The plans as amended are for consideration here.

Lancing Parish Council: - No objection

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

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

Planning Assessment

Generally there are no objections 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 and the impact upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. Consideration here is given to how the current, amended scheme differs from that which was previously refused.

Residential Amenity

As with the previous consent the attached semi no. 4 would not be impacted by the proposal which would be screened on the whole by the main building. The reduction in scale and footprint of the extension also contributed to the limited impact here.

The dwelling directly to the south is a bungalow on a relatively large corner plot. The previous proposal was considered to have an enclosing effect upon this adjacent dwelling but it was not considered to be so oppressive or overbearing to warrant a refusal due to the distance from the boundary and the orientation of the bungalow. As the current scheme represents a reduction in scale the same applies in this case.

There is the addition of the two side windows on the southern elevation. These will need to be obscurely glazed to avoid any overlooking or unneighbourly impact to the

adjacent bungalow. Also non opening unless above 1.7 metres above finished floor level. A condition is attached below.

Visual Amenity and Character

The pair of semi-detached dwellings as stated above are unique within this street. They are prominent due to both their position and orientation within the street scene but also due to their 2-storey scale in this area which is predominantly bungalows. The pair are symmetrical and have attractive front gables, cat slide roofs and recessed porches. The previous scheme was considered to be to the detriment of the character of the pair. Yet as reduced and redesigned the subservience to the building recognises and respects the existing scale, with lower ridge height, set back and reduced depth. The proposed side windows also seek to visually break up the scale of the side, blank elevation.

The roof form as amended relates to the design of the main roof, relating to the scale and design of the host dwelling. Although the extension is clearly visible its redesign improves the impact upon the street scene and surrounding built environment.

Recommendation

1. Time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Materials to match existing
4. No additional openings in the side
5. Obscurely glazed side windows and non opening unless above 1.7 metres.

Informative

1. Proactive with amendments

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 2nd October 2017

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 05.10.2017