Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – Approve**
AWDM/0867/12

Site: **7 Rosslyn Road, Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 6WL**

Proposal: **Proposed side/rear extension (existing side projection demolished)**

Date of site visit: 26.07.12

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings
The application relates to the eastern half of a pair of semi-detached houses, which were built circa 1900, and are located on the north side of the road.

Permission is sought for the demolition of a single-storey lean-to extension (utility room and store) to the east of the existing two-storey out-rigger, and the erection of a single-storey part side, part rear extension. The proposals would result in the loss of a number of internal dividing walls and the formation of a large open plan living/kitchen space. The rear extension would project beyond the rear elevation of the house by 4.2m, and would have a pitched slate tiled roof with ridge roof lights, which would follow along the side of the proposals at the same angle.

The attached dwelling is of similar design with no rear extensions, and it is separated by a 1.5m high boundary wall.

The applicant has submitted a supporting statement which states that the dwelling will continue to be used as a residential dwelling for Mr Spence and Mrs Lindon-Spence, who both currently work from home (Mr Spence as a chartered Architect, and Mrs Lindon-Spence as a private singing tutor, in addition to the pair teaching Tango dancing occasionally).

Mrs Lindon-Spence rents private studios in Shoreham and London for classes with groups of singers, and the use of the dwelling would continue for the one-to-one lessons, the same as undertaken since 1997 for approximately 4-8 hours per week. The applicants teach Tango dancing to groups and will continue to do so at The Shoreham Centre, however occasional one-to-one classes will be undertaken at the dwelling.

The applicant states that the level of teaching will not be increased and it will continue to be ancillary to the residential use of the house, with the ground floor continuing to be used primarily as a residential space. The level of music (associated with the teaching) will not be increased and the same equipment will be used as existing, although the level of acoustic insulation will be increased greatly.

Relevant site history
SU/202/05/TP – rear extension, rebuilding of side extension with increased height and reduction of rear bay (Application for certificate of lawfulness for proposed development. Permitted 10.11.05.

The lawful development certificate was granted on the basis of it (and any other extensions) totalling less than 70 cubic metres in volume. £10,000 of work was undertaken to increase the structure of the loft of the dwelling to accommodate the storage of household items, and the purchase of the solid beech flooring. However the extension was not started and due to the changes in the 'permitted development' Order in 2008, the LDC became invalid.

Representations

Third Parties: The owner of No.5 Rosslyn Road has no objections to the proposal going ahead on the proviso that there would be no group dance classes, no teaching during the evenings, and most people being taught would be local and could walk to No.9.

Relevant Planning Policies
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
South East Plan (GOSE 2009): CC1, CC6, BE1
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle
The proposals are to extend this late Victorian semi-detached dwelling, to allow for the formation of a large open-plan living space of modern proportions and design. The extension and remodelling it itself are considered to be in compliance with policy in principle, and the use of the current home for running a 'one-man' architecture business and singing tutoring is considered to be ancillary to the use as a domestic dwelling. The increase in use of the space as a dance studio for example or for an increased level of activity associated with the applicants existing businesses may require a separate application for a change of use in the future. However given that the use has been undertaken since 1997 without objection, and that the applicants merely intend to continue at this level, it is not considered that the proposals would result in a change of use on the basis of the extension being built.

Visual amenity
The proposed extension would be of sympathetic design to the existing white rendered side extension, and would be a sleek and well detailed form of architecture, allowing for the total remodelling of the ground floor into a multi-use living space. The extension would be screened from the road by the existing built form of the dwellings within the street, and owing to the size of the garden it is not considered that the extension would overwhelm or feel particularly out of scale.

The proposed extension would result in the loss of a first floor bay window which is an original feature, however it is proposed to replace it with a pair of timber sash windows. The bay is in need of repair, however it does not contribute to the amenity of the streetscene and its loss would not warrant refusal in this case.

Residential amenity
The proposals would be located to the north of the dwelling, adjacent to the boundary with the attached property (No.5), but inset from the existing boundary wall by a nominal 0.2m. The side elevation of the extensions would have a wall height of 2.5m with a hidden gutter arrangement. The design is considered to be very unfussy and would not result in encroachment of the neighbours property. The addition would improve the screening at boundary level and would improve the privacy of the rear patio of No.5.

The proposals do extend beyond the normal 3.5m maximum as proposed in the DC Control Standard. However the northernmost part of the extension would be adjacent to, and screened by, a mature apple tree growing in the garden of No.5, and in the location of a mature bay tree in the garden of No.7, which are both to be retained.

Overall it is not considered that, on balance, the proposals would have such an overbearing impact that it would warrant refusal, particularly bearing in mind the existing foreshortened outlook that exists from the rear of No.5 by the existing trees.

The extension would be inset from the detached neighbour to the east by 2m, and it would be well screened by a 1.8m high boundary fence and shrubs growing in the garden. No.9 has a utility room in the western elevation with windows facing to the west and north. It is not considered that the impact of the conservatory be significant due to its size and the separation, and any loss of outlook from the neighbours utility room would not be significant.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed rear extension would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of No5 and No.7 Rosslyn Road. It would consequently not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) or the policies of the South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1)

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Roof materials to match existing dwelling etc
3. No windows or other openings in west or east side walls of the extension etc
4. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Drawing No: A-08 Date Received: 13.07.12

Drawing No: A-01B	Date Received: 13.07.12
Drawing No: A-02A	Date Received: 13.07.12
Drawing No: A-03B	Date Received: 13.07.12
Drawing No: A-04B	Date Received: 13.07.12
Drawing No: A-05B	Date Received: 13.07.12
Drawing No: A-06B	Date Received: 13.07.12
Drawing No: A-07	Date Received: 14.08.12

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

Case Officer: C. Hone Date: 24.09.12

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 25 September 2012