# Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: AWDM/0213/15 Recommendation – APPROVE**

**Site: 17 Rosemary Drive Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 6HT**

**Proposal: Two storey side extension with widened front and rear dormers**

**Date of site visit:** 19.03.2015

**Neighbours checked: Y**

**Additional neighbour notifications: N**

**Proposal, Site and Surroundings**

The application property comprises a semi-detached chalet house occupying a corner plot at the junction of Rosemary Drive with Lavender Hill. The original front and rear dormers on the dwelling have previously been widened, a single-storey extension added to the west side plus a rear conservatory.

The surrounding roads are made up of a similar chalet houses and 2-storey houses set within an open-plan layout. The surrounding land rises up to the north and west.

Permission is sought for a 2-storey extension on the west side absorbing the existing single-storey element. It would be 2.4m wide with an overall depth of 9.2m, replicating the chalet form of the original dwelling and the front and rear dormers. The additional accommodation would consist of a study and utility room on the ground-floor, with enlarged bedrooms, dressing room and enlarged bathroom on the first-floor.

**Relevant Planning History**

New screen wall on side boundary. Approved 1987 (SU/213/87 refers)
Single-storey side extension. Approved 2004 (SU/142/04 refers)

**Consultations:** None

**Representations:** None received.

**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’
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012).

**Planning Assessment**

***Principle***

There is no objection in principle to the proposed development which involves an extension to an existing dwelling house. The key considerations are the effects on the appearance of the existing dwelling and the character of the surrounding area and the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

***Visual amenity***

The extension would replicate the distinctive chalet form of the existing dwelling. An amendment has been received reducing the overall width of the proposed front and rear dormers to create a larger gap between the dormer cheek and the verge of the roof, and would appear more in keeping with the original dormer design.

Fundamentally the widened form of the dwelling will unbalance the proportions of the original pair. The paired chalet form recurs throughout this estate. There are no other examples of similar extensions evident in the vicinity and approval in this case may make it difficult in the future for the Council to resist other proposals that are similar. On the other hand, an extension designed to appear more subordinate to the host dwelling, for example, by setting back the front wall or setting down the ridge height as advised in the Council's DC Standard No.3, would probably appear as a more conspicuous form of extension. On balance extending by repeating the form of the existing dwelling is probably the most sensitive way of enlarging this distinctive style of dwelling at 2 storeys.

In townscape terms the 'bulk' of the extension compared to the existing single-storey addition will have some enclosing effect on the existing corner although the historic re-positioning the boundary wall to the back edge of the pavement along Lavender Hill (to enlarge the rear garden) has already had the effect of diminishing the sense of openness compared to the wide margins that are characteristic elsewhere within this estate. The pair of chalet houses on the opposite corner of this junction are positioned on slightly higher ground and extend further southwards than the front of the application property. Consequently although the extension would be appear reasonably prominent being elevated in relation to Rosemary Drive, it would not appear unduly dominant or visually obtrusive within the context of this junction. A distance of approximately 2.75m will be retained between the extension and the gently-splayed front south-west corner of the plot which will remain open-plan.

***Residential amenity***

There would be no impact on the attached dwelling, No.19. The most affected properties will be 1 and 3 Lavender Hill on the opposite (west) side of the junction which are sited at 90º to the application property. Nevertheless a distance of some 17m will be retained between the extension and the front of these dwellings such that the effect of the additional 'bulk' extending closer would not be unduly intrusive or overbearing. A first-floor window in the side elevation is shown as obscurely glazed to avoid the potential for overlooking.

**Recommendation**

**APPROVE**

**Subject to Conditions:-**

1. Standard 3 Year Time Limit

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:-

   Drawing No: 15526-Loc Location Plan and Block Plan date received: 13.02.2015
   Drawing No: 15526-02 Existing Floor Plans & Elevations Date received: 13.02.2015
   Drawing No: 15526-01 Rev B Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

3. The external materials and finishes of the development hereby permitted shall be completed to match in design, colour and texture those of the existing building unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
4. First-floor window in side elevation to be obscurely-glazed and fixed shut except 1.7m above floor.
5. No additional windows in side elevation

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 24.03.2015

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 25 March 2015