Expires 09.10.09

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0323/09 Recommendation - Refuse

Site: **81 Old Fort Road Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5HA**

Proposal: **Flat-roofed two-storey east side extension**

The Application

The application relates to a detached two-storey house built in 1919 located on the north side of Old Fort Road. The existing dwelling is a large detached house with a hipped roof, tiled in glazed cobalt-blue roof tiles. To the east side is what appears to be a two-storey extension which makes up part of the east side boundary with the adjacent bungalow (No. 83). Currently the dwelling has a balcony across the whole front of the dwelling which increases in depth over the front entrance portico.

The proposals, as amended, are for a two storey part-side, part front extension which incorporates a front balcony.

The proposed extension would be 2.8m in width, by 8.6m in depth, by 4.1m in height, with the first floor extension being only 5.5m in depth, with the proposed balcony making up the remaining 3.1m. The proposals would be a painted render finish to match the existing building with a flat roof. The proposed extension would be used a living room extension, and additional living area, with a bedroom extension and balcony extension at first floor.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: There has been one letter of objection to the proposals. The owner of the adjacent bungalow (No. 83) have concerns regarding further loss of daylight to their garden, loss of privacy from the proposed side windows, and concerns regarding the footings of their property being disturbed.

[NB: It is noted that concerns raised regarding the type of foundations that may be used on the development would be a matter for a Building Regulations submission, and/or the provisions of the Party Wall Act, rather than a planning matter to be considered.]

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, relation specifically to extensions and alterations to dwellings, states that they should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable loss of light or privacy or have an overbearing effect on the neighbouring dwelling and be sympathetic to the original dwelling. Supplementary Planning Guidance in DC Standard No. 3 'Extensions and Alteration to Dwellings' states that two-storey side extensions should be set back at least 1m from the side boundary to prevent a 'terracing' effect should the neighbour wish to erect a similar extension. It also states that side extensions that are clearly visible from the road should be designed to closely match the existing dwelling. In particular they should have a roof in keeping with the existing dwelling which in most cases, will mean a pitched roof. The extension should usually be set back slightly from the main front wall of the dwelling to create a visual break and ensure the extension is subordinate to the main dwelling.

Visual amenity

In this case the amended plans show that the two-storey side extension would be located directly onto the boundary with the adjacent bungalow. Whilst this would not appear to create a terracing effect as it is unlikely that the neighbouring dwelling would extend at two storey level, it is still considered that the extension would result in the dwelling ~~from~~ appearing overly cramped within the site. The extension (as amended) would project in front of the existing main house, and although the proposed balcony extension would help to integrate the extension into the main building the ground floor projection would add to the visual bulk of the overall addition. The lack of a natural break between the extended dwelling and the low level scale of the adjacent bungalow would have a very dominant appearance in terms of the effect on the streetscene.

The extension is proposed to have a flat roof, whereas the existing main section of the house has a tiled hipped roof, with the rear/side two-storey addition having a ridged gabled roof design. The proposed flat roof would be a third type of roof design and it is considered that it would be out of keeping with the appearance of the original dwelling and consequently would add to the incongruous, cramped appearance of the extension.

Residential amenity

The proposed extension would, when attached to the existing two-storey extension, create a flank wall of the building that would be 4.5m in height, by 11.9m in length, located directly onto the boundary with the adjacent bungalow (No.83). The single-storey section with balcony balustrade would be an additional 3.1m in length by 3.3m in height.

The bungalow to the east is diminutive in scale and has a driveway to its west, with a single garage to the rear of the property, and two sets of windows with a western outlook. The owner of No.83 has objected on the grounds of loss of privacy and sunlight.

Sunlight
It is considered that the projecting front element of the extension, comprising the balcony and ground floor extension would be the only part that could possibly affect natural daylight, given the rear of the extension would sit aside the existing two-storey building. The amount of direct sunlight into the side of the property would be affected, however the separation between the built forms being 3.5m would be such that it is considered it would not result in this being reduced to an unacceptable level.

Privacy
With regards to loss of privacy, the proposed extension would have a high level window at ground floor level and a standard height window in the first floor bedroom extension, both in the eastern elevation of the extension. Whilst it is considered that these could lead to a loss of privacy it would be considered normal practice for them to be subject to a planning condition requiring that they are both fixed shut and obscurely glazed. Thus preventing a loss of privacy.

The proposed balcony however could not be so easily restricted. A visibility screen is likely to add to the incongruous nature of the proposed extension given the difference in scale between the bungalow and the application house. Whilst the front of No.83 is on view from the main road and levels of privacy are expected to be somewhat lower than more private areas of the dwelling, such as the rear garden, it is still considered that the proximity of the balcony, and by the effect of overlooking the whole of the adjacent house and parts of the rear garden, would be particularly unneighbourly.

Overbearing effect
The main concern with the proposals is the overbearing effect that it would have on the adjacent bungalow. The flank wall would appear large and overbearing given the overall length when attached to the existing two-storey extension. The proximity to the boundary and the length to which it would project in front of the neighbouring site would add to how unneighbourly this would appear, given the small scale of No.83.

In conclusion it is considered that the design of the proposed extension would not be in any way subordinate to the original dwelling; it is totally unsympathetic in terms of its design; and it would have a detrimental effect on the visual amenity of the surrounding area. The scale of the proposed extension and its proximity to the boundary would have a particularly overbearing and uneighbourly effect on the adjacent bungalow, which would result in a loss of amenity to them.

Recommendation

REFUSE for reason that :-

B5BR

H20R – amended
…resulting in loss of privacy and an overbearing…etc.

Case Officer: [redacted]
Date: 16.09.09.

RB 17/9/09