DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

Application Number: **Recommendation – Refuse**

Site: **2 Park Lane Southwick**

Proposal: **Two storey rear extension and rear dormer positioned at eaves height**

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Yes

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): No

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site is located on a prominent and sensitive corner site orientated towards onto Southwick Green, an elongated open space. The site falls within the Southwick Green Conservation Area. The majority of buildings are houses and there is a mix between detached, semi-detached and terraced styles.

The application property is one such building. It is a Victorian house from the early 1900s, with good architectural detailing. The building is on elevated land compared to surrounding properties, and set forward of the immediate properties along Park Lane (Nos. 4 and 6). This means its western roof slope is exposed to public view along with its prominent chimney.

PROPOSAL:

Permission sought for two-storey rear extensions (each to measure, at max, some 5.8 metres in height, 2.5 metres in length, and 1.8 metres in width), with hipped roof rear dormer to measure 2.8 some metres in height, 2.9 metres in length, and 2.5 metres in width

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

None

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

South East Plan
BE1, BE6, CC1, CC4, CC6

Adur Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies):
AG1, AH7, AB4
SPG Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
SPG Southwick Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Strategy (July 2009)

National Planning Policy Guidance
PPS1, PPS5

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Conservation Area Advisory Committee: *No objection*

Borough Environmental Health: *add precautionary contamination condition*

REPRESENTATIONS RESPONSES

Letters of objection received from occupiers of Nos. 19 and 21 The Green and No. 4 Park Lane, content summarised below

Currently no upper storey windows on west side to overlook patio. Recently chopped screening shrubs. Do not wish any further deterioration to privacy. Application asserts extension will cause minimal loss of light, but not true. Roof line of his house higher than others and together with shed - however was that authorised? - already casts long shadow. Looms up and almost completely blocks winter sunlight from entering kitchen and breakfast room. Currently very small gap through sun will shine. Extension will block this chink of light for at least two winter months, depriving me. I suffer from S.A.D. We know how important vitamin D (the sunlight vitamin) is to immune system and preventing diseases. Will cause noise, disturbance and dust, over several weeks at least. Work from home to offset my Pension Credit by teaching students. Need peace and quiet to main concentration. Will lose all during building operations and be impoverished. Compete ground floor plan not presented. Gives impression it is small house but twice size and looks squeezed on plot. Previous owner purchased half neighbour garden and built this monster. Already has attic conversion so no shortage of space. Completely out of keeping with The Green and Park Lane. Park Lane is bus route with restricted parking: double yellow lines on both sides and on a dangerous blind bend with two junctions were parking is wild. Access for any builders' vehicles restricted. Major thoroughfare for pedestrian pupils at three local schools. Going to lose light within property/garden and this will devalue my property. Garden is very small and do not get sun for much of day due to existing building. Overdevelopment. Significant loss of light to rear rooms in particular sun room, kitchen and to some parts of my garden.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

Introduction

The principal planning considerations with this proposal are:-

- Its impact on amenity of neighbours
- Its impact on integrity of design of dwelling and character and appearance of the Conservation Area

The site is not contaminated so an informative would suffice to raise the applicant's awareness of the risk.

Design and character, including Conservation Area

The property falls within Area 4: *The Green* of The Southwick Conservation Area. The application property is a period property with some good architectural detail. It occupies a highly visible position on an important corner plot, within the setting of green space of Southwick Green. For these reasons it makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, and is a Heritage Asset under the terms of PPS5 in its own right.

The character appraisal for this part of The Southwick Conservation Area states:-

"The scale of development is relatively uniform being approximately two storeys in height across the whole area … this domestic scale overlooking the park forms an important part of the character of the area."

In its present design the application property is characteristic of this domestic scale. Its two-storey appearance is reflected in its original unaltered flank roof slope that is highly visible from public vantage point.

The two-storey rear extension closely follows the design and style of its host dwelling (the window designs on the south elevation being particularly well conceived), so this element of the scheme would be not be harmful.

Notwithstanding some discreet dormers in the surrounding area (including on No. 19 The Green) the preponderant visual character is that of retained original roof slopes.

This characteristic part of the application property would be materially harmed by the proposed dormer, which fails to assimilate well into the area. This harmful impact would be amplified by the excessive size of the dormer with its incongruous hipped roof, which would draw undue attention to this new roof addition by way of excessive bulk and overt prominence.

And further harm would arise from the awkward position of the dormer, which ruptures through the eaves of the host property and sits poorly against the chimney. This is a highly inappropriate and unsatisfactory design response whereby the roof addition would be interpreted as neither as a sympathetic first floor extension nor a true dormer.

In all, it would appear as a visually obtrusive element in the street to the detriment of the architectural integrity of its host and the prevailing character and appearance of the street, and thereby would materially harm the prevailing characteristics of the Conservation Area.

Neighbours

The neighbours principally affected by the proposal as those to the rear and side (the application is remote from the remainder)

Concern has been raised over noise and disturbance from construction work.

But adequate controls exist under Environmental Health legislation to mitigate unacceptable impact arising from this. Parking on the highway is controlled by the Highway Authority who can enforce against illegal/dangerous parked vehicles.

Neighbour to rear (No.4 Park Lane)

The extension would curtail some light to this neighbour. But daylight and sunlight and outlook to this property is already greatly limited by the present silhouette of the existing building.

Moreover, a distance of over 14 metres is retained between the proposed extension and the flank of the neighbouring building. This distance would avoid the extension from casting an unacceptable extent of shadow onto the habitable room windows of this property. It also ensures that, taking account of the movement of the sun during the day, the amount of light entering that building would not be materially diminished to an extent that the neighbour's living conditions would be irreparably harmed. The neighbouring building is orientated north to south, so the principal outlook from it would be unaltered.

Overlooking from the rear dormer onto this neighbour would be largely onto their front garden so loss of privacy would not be materially harmful, and the orientation of the two buildings means direct overlooking would not occur.

Neighbour to north (No. 19 The Green)

The two-storey extension would be built up to abut the shared boundary with this neighbour. This would bring built form closer to the neighbouring building and its habitable room windows.

Nonetheless, the flank of the extension is some distance away from the neighbouring building (some 5 metres at least). This means the shadow cast by the extension would be largely onto the rearmost part of the back garden of the neighbour, with the windows of any habitable room largely unaffected. So loss of light and overshadowing arising from the development would not be of an unacceptable nature. Because the extension is set off some distance away from the neighbouring building, any overbearing would be largely limited to being perceived only at the far end of the neighbour's garden; the effect when standing inside the house itself would be marginal.

No windows/openings are proposed in the extension flank facing this neighbour so direct overlooking is negated. The overlooking from the rear dormer would be oblique onto the neighbour, so intrusive loss of privacy would be avoided.

<u>Conclusion</u>

Despite the change in floor levels at first floor between the existing building and the proposed extensions, it is feasible to provide sufficient light and outlook to the enlarged bedroom by way of high level windows as an alternative to the casement dormer as the south elevation window can be relied upon as the principal means of light and outlook to the room.

Over the course of the life of the application the planning officer made persistent contact with the applicant via their agent, explaining the unacceptability of the dormer and the alternative solution as described above. The applicant has declined to amend the scheme and so, accordingly, the application is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION:

REFUSE, for the following reason:

The proposed dormer would, by reason of its bulky and incongruous hipped roof and awkward unsympathetic positioning on the roof-slope breaking though the eaves and sat against the chimney, create a visual alien oddity to the detriment of the architectural integrity of the host building within the street scene and of roofline of the surrounding houses in the locality to the detriment of the established character and appearance of this part of the Southwick Conservation Area.

As such the proposal conflicts with Saved Adur Local Plan policies AG1, AB4, and AH7, together with allied SPG Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' and SPG Southwick Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Strategy (July 2009), and South East Plan policies CC6, BE1, and BE6 and the guiding principles of PPS5.

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?

No

DELEGATED

Case Officer
Sign Matthew Porter Date 9th February 2012.

Authorising Officer
Sign: Keith Morgan Date: 9th February 2012