Expiry Date - 14/06/2010

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0136/10 **Recommendation – Permit Application**

Site: **13 Springate Road Southwick Brighton West Sussex**

Proposal: **Roof extension with rear gable to provide rooms in roof (with rear Juliet balcony) (re-submission of ADC/0459/09)**

The Application

The application follows the recent refusal of a similar application for a slightly larger proposed rear first-floor extension (ADC/0459/09). The subsequent appeal was dismissed. The Inspector stated that:-

> *'the proposed extensive roof area would unreasonably dominate the immediate outlook from this kitchen window (that of No.11 to the north) and would be likely to reduce the amount of sunlight and daylight entering the kitchen. This would create an oppressive and unsatisfactory living environment to the detriment of its occupiers.*

The application relates to a detached, hipped roof bungalow located on the east side of the road. The bungalow is from the inter-war period, and is of a standard painted render finish with brick plinth, with a plain tiled roof. The property has previously been extended with a flat roofed single-storey rear extension across the whole of the bungalow. The extension was erected under 'permitted development' in 2004.

Permission is now sought to extend the roof of the bungalow over part of the existing rear extension. The roof extension would be 7.5m wide, by 3.4m in height, with a ridge depth of 7.5m. The proposals would allow for an additional two bedroom and bathroom to be created. The larger of the two bedrooms which would occupy the proposed extension would be served by a pair of full height doors and side lights with a Juliette balcony.

Directly to the south of the site is No.15, the north half of a pair of semi-detached bungalows of a similar construction style and era. It has been extended to the rear by a small flat roofed extension approximately 2m in depth, and the property is separated from the application dwelling by the width of the applicants driveway and a narrow footpath totalling 4m in width. Directly to the north is No.11, the southern half of a pair of semi-detached bungalows which have both been extensively extended and modified. No.15 has extended to the rear with flat-roofed extension and a conservatory, which attaché to the rear and side of the property and incorporate the former detached garage, which has been converted into habitable accommodation. The roof has also been extended with a south side part-hipped gable, two front dormers, a rear gabled extension (over part of the ground floor extension), and a rear dormer. As a consequence of the additional ground

floor accommodation, the kitchen of No.11 is particularly dark and has only one outlook, directly to the south at the existing flat roofed extension of the application site. To the east are bungalows in Hadrian Avenue, many of which have rear extensions.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: There has been one letter of objection to the proposals from the owner of No.14 Hadrian Avenue to the east. They object on the basis of loss of privacy as the development will look directly into their rear garden.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.'
PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies
Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general.

Development Control Standard No.3 entitled 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' states that roof extensions should respect the scale, character and appearance of existing dwellings.

Visual amenity
Although there were concerns that the former refused proposal would have been out of character with the original scale of the bungalow, the inspector did not share the same opinion. With regards to the former design he stated that he: *'considered the design and appearance of the new roof would be in keeping with the existing dwelling and would not be prominent in the street scene.'*

The current submission is of a similar scale, however the design has been improved with the loss of the flat roofed area in the centre. It is therefore considered that the proposed amended scheme would not be detrimental to the character of the existing dwelling or that of the surrounding area.

Residential amenity
The former refused application proposed a first-floor extension the whole width of the existing rear extension which would have dominated the outlook from the side kitchen of the adjacent bungalow to the north, and adversely affected the sunlight and daylight to it.

The proposals are now such that the main bulk of the roof extension would be inset from this northern side. The main slope of the roof would be at its closest 3.2m from the boundary with No.11 (5.7m from the widow itself), whereas the ridge would be 6.8m away (9.3m from the window). It is now considered that the main bulk of the roof has been moved sufficiently southwards to prevent their being an unacceptable effect on the sunlight or daylight available to the kitchen of No.11. The small dummy infill roof would have an effect on the outlook, however due to its height only being 1m it is not considered that this would give a particularly oppressive effect.

The above DC Standard states that principal windows in rear extension should be located 22m from principal windows of dwellings at the rear, and that a garden length of at least 11m should be retained. The proposed Juliette balcony would be located some 42m from the rear of the objectors dwelling to the east (14 Hadrian Avenue), and given that the applicants own rear garden is 19m it is considered that the level of overlooking that would be expected would not be so bad as to warrant refusal on the grounds of loss of privacy.

Recommendation

Approved for reason that :-

1PPi

1. C1Ci
2. C12Eii
3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 477/01 date stamped received 19 April 2010.
   Reason: *For the avoidance...*etc

[redacted] 19/5

Case Officer: Carlos Hone Date: 19.05.10

Planning Services Manager: [redacted] Date: 19/5/10

Chairman of the Planning Committee: [redacted] Date: 21/5/10

Expiry Date - 14/06/2010