Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0319/17 **Recommendation-REFUSE**

Site: **25 Freshbrook Road, Lancing, BN15 8DA**

Proposal: **First floor side and rear extension to north and east elevations**

Date of site visit: 24.04.2017

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a much extended two storey end of terrace residential dwellinghouse. The rear garden is full of sheds and storage boxes and children's play equipment. The lawn has been covered with plastic grass.

Freshbrook Road is characterised by a mix of residential properties, with the beginning being predominantly two storey terracing and then there is a mix of detached; semi-detached dwellings and bungalows. Indeed, a row of bungalows start after the application dwelling to the east; there is a car bar also next to the site which appears at first appears as a bungalow. Between the car barn and the application site, is an access road that leads to a bungalow to the rear of no. 25

Proposal

The proposal seeks permission to construct a further storey over the existing single storey extension. The roof would be hipped with a flat roof centre section.

The rear (north) elevation would have 3no. windows and 1no. Juliette balcony. The existing north elevation would have an existing window replaced with a further Juliette balcony.

The front (south) elevation would have 2no. windows lining up with the 2no. ground floor windows.

Both of the side (east and west) elevations will have no windows or other openings within it.

The height of the overall two storey section would be approx. 7m and the other measurements are approx. 7m for the east elevation; approx. 2.8m for the west elevation; approx. 4m for the front, south elevation; and approx. 7m wide for the rear, north elevation.

Consultations:

***Lancing Parish Council*:** No objections

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

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

Relevant Planning History

L/118/88/TP/874 First floor rear extension Approved 28.07.1988

L/18/93/TP/77/29 Two storey side extension (garage with bedroom above). Approved 29.03.1993

L/95/98/TP Single storey extension and conservatory at side and rear Approved 04.08.1998

L/24/97/TP Two storey side extension (plus bedroom in roofspace with front dormer)
Approved 02.04.1997

L/107/92/TP Two storey side extension (to provide accommodation for dependent relative.
Refused 16.11.1992

L/27/82/TP Demolish existing dwelling, erect new block of four one bedroom flats on two storeys together with access road and five parking bays
Approved. 16.03.1982

Planning Assessment

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

Site designations

Strategic Flood Risk Assessment:
Fluvial Floodplain Delineation: Tidal Flood Zone 2, 3a
Environment Agency Flood Zone 2, 3

Visual Amenity & Character

The property is quite visual within the street scene having an existing single storey wrap around extension and being next to an access road and bungalows. Indeed, when travelling west along Freshbrook Road, the property is noticeable and can be seen from a distance.

The two storey extension will also be very visible along this road, and it will be visually dominant by reason of its close proximity to the single storey neighbouring structures and also because of the bulk and massing of the extension. There is a bungalow to the rear approx. 19m distant from the extension which will add to the fact that the proposal will be out of scale and a bulky form of development.

Further, the proposal is showing a lot of fenestration to its rear upper floor, which will also include 2no. Juliette balconies windows.

The street scene comprises a high density form of development, but there is a noticeable chronological pattern to the street, with generally the older properties sited near the railway station to the west, and mainly in terraced form, and the progression along the street is constructed at a later period. The building progression does not unacceptably impact on those that have gone before even with the juxtaposition of bungalows to two storey dwellings. But in this instance, it is considered that that character of progression is compromised by the bulk and mass of the first floor extension sited in an isometric manner on the wrap around corner of the existing dwellinghouse. It would be conspicuous and would appear bulky and incongruous to the street scene and would resulting in an uncharacteristic form of development.

Residential Amenity

The neighbours which could have their residential amenities directly affected by the proposal are 23, 25a, 29, 108 Freshbrook Road, and 44 Brook Way.

No. 23 lies directly to the west and is part of the terrace relating to the application site. There is no doubt that the additional storey will be readily viewed from that property. There is already the rear first floor extension that is on the boundary with no. 23, this extension lies to their east, and thereby there is already a slight reduction in morning light to that property.

No. 25a is a bungalow and lies directly to the rear of the application site, indeed it is understood that it was built within the former garden land of no. 25, and that it is occupied by a relative. Notwithstanding this, it is also quite clear that the occupants, current and future, of the bungalow will be exposed to the large bulk of the resultant dwelling which lies to its south. However, at 19m distance between the properties, it is not considered that the first floor extension would result in demonstrable harm onto that property.

No. 29, also a bungalow, lies to the east of the proposal, but again is some 19m distant from it, thereby it too will not be demonstrably harmed by the development, by way of overlooking or overshadowing.

Both 108 Freshbrook Road and 44 Brook Way are still further from the proposal, thereby there will be no demonstrable overlooking, or overshadowing onto these properties either.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the following reason

1. By reason of its size, siting, massing and design the proposed first floor extension would be poorly related in visual terms to the host dwelling and would result in a prominent and unsympathetic form of development that would detract from the appearance of the existing building and character of the surrounding area generally. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved policy AH7 of the Adur Local Plan and policy 15 of the Submission Adur Local Plan 2016

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

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 08.05. 2017

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 09.50.2017