Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/2154/21 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 27 Downside, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Raising and extension of roof to form part gable to front and rear and single storey front and rear extensions. Light grey cedral cladding to be used for front and rear gables.

Date of site visit: 17th January 2022

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a hipped roof detached bungalow within a street which is dominated by properties which originally were constructed with this design. With hipped roofs, front projection, a front garden, driveway and entrance to the side. Many properties still retain this character whilst others have been extended and remodelled with raised ridge heights, front and rear gable extensions, side dormers and rear extensions visible in the street scene. Variation has been gradually introduced and a mixture of property styles currently exists. Examples of recent ridge height increases are nos. 4 (AWDM/1864/21), 11,(AWDM/1981/20) 17, (AWDM/1105/19), 25, (AWDM/2091/21)

The current proposal is in keeping with the character of the former consents with a raised ridge, front and rear gable extensions, a single storey flat roof extension to the existing rear extension and a single storey extension to the front north west corner. A rear juliette balcony is proposed also. In this case the applicant is proposing light grey cedral cladding to the front and rear gable.

Representations

2 representations received from the owner/occupier of no. 131 Greenways Crescent, 23 Downside and 29 Downside.

- The position of the Juliette balcony would result in a loss of privacy at the top of the garden at no. 131 Greenways Crescent.
- The new windows on the east facing elevation of the ground and first floor will overlook.
- The juliette balcony to the south elevation may allow access onto the flat roof over the ground floor kitchen which would impact upon privacy.
- The proposed juliette balcony will overlook the neighbouring rear garden.
- The front elevation extended forward, hips extended and ridge lifted it will be overbearing to no. 29 which has windows facing onto no. 27.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

Planning Assessment

Principle

The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Visual amenity

The changes to the bungalow will be clearly visible within the street scene with the increased ridge height and front gable changing the character of the bungalow significantly. The proposed cladding will also give a more contemporary appearance to the traditional style dwelling. However it is considered that these changes will contribute to the current variation which exists within the street scene. The ridge height will match that of 11, 17 and the adjacent bungalow at no. 25. No dormers are proposed so a simplistic gabled roof is proposed with roof lights. There are other examples of cladding in Downside so would not be an alien feature and in the light of the existing street scene can be supported.

The ground floor single storey extension will square off the front recessed section, this is inline with other consents in the street. The rear extension is currently of flat roof design and is 2.8 metres in depth. This is to be increased to 4.5 metres total depth. It is to match the existing flat roof design with render to match existing.

Residential amenity

The main properties to be affected by the development are those either side of the bungalow and to the rear. Representations have been received from those either side and no. 31 to the rear in Greenways Crescent. To the rear properties are at a lower ground level and there is concern that the proposed juliette balcony will overlook the garden to the rear/south. Consideration is given to the direct overlooking from the proposed first floor window to the rear windows of the existing neighbouring property. This is in excess of 22 metres and therefore there would not be any justification to resist the application as a result of loss of privacy.

To the east is no. 25 which has recently had consent for a similar development which included a raising of the ridge and side dormers. It appears that the representation in this case received from no. 23 was referring to no. 25 and was considered in the determination of this application. However it is deemed appropriate to add a condition to ensure that there is no use of the roof of the extension for a terrace or balcony. The roof lights of the

east side of the building will be conditioned to be obscurely glazed with no additional openings permitted to protect the amenities of no. 25. The east side ground floor windows remain unchanged from that as existing. There is spacing between no 25 and 27 and the single storey rear extension as proposed will not extend more than 4.5 metres beyond the rear elevation. Development Management Standards state that if properties are attached that a depth of 3.5 metres is generally acceptable in terms of loss of light and overbearing impact. Therefore in this case there is spacing between the properties and the depth of 4.5 metres with a flat roof is therefore acceptable. Consent at no. 25 also included the rebuilding of the existing single storey extension therefore the proposed extension in this case will be alongside the extension at the neighbouring property.

To the west is no. 29, this dwelling differs in design and scale from the application site; it is wider, higher and semi detached. There are windows on the east elevation facing the application site. The owner/occupiers are concerned with regards to the impact upon these windows in terms of loss of light and overlooking. There is also concern highlighted with regards to the rear juliette balcony overlooking the patio to the rear of no. 29.

The front extension is on the west side and will bring the corner of the bungalow in line with the east side matching the front building line of the adjacent property. There will be no impact as a result of this infill. On the west side the increased ridge height will be visible with front and rear barn hipped gables. This will increase the bulk of the roof however, on balance the impact upon the side windows of no. 29 is not such to warrant a refusal in this case. The windows on the side elevation at ground floor serve a kitchen and hall. It is considered that due to the proximity of no. 27 and these being at ground floor that there will already be limited light to these windows and the increased bulk and height will increase this however not to a degree to warrant a refusal. The slope of the roof and the driveway at the side of No.29 will maintain a gap to No.29 and allow some light to continue to reach the side of that property. At first floor the windows serve a bathroom and landing and therefore are not considered to be habitable rooms and again would not warrant refusal in terms of loss of light or overbearing impact. A refusal on these grounds could not be substantiated.

The rear juliette balcony faces south and does not project beyond the rear of the building with inward opening doors only. As stated above the direct views to the south are not at a distance of less than 22 metres window to window. Therefore it is considered that this relationship is acceptable. The occupiers of no. 29 are concerned with regards to oblique views from inside the window toward the adjacent patio below. This is not a direct view and overlooking would only occur to this space when right up to the glazing and looking down and across. When inside the room no direct overlooking would occur. This relationship is commonplace in streets with first floor windows adjacent to rear gardens and in this case there is the separation of a driveway between the dwellings. A refusal cannot be justified in this case.

The rear extension at 4.5 metres in depth with a flat roof will not impact upon the adjacent dwelling, due to the spacing and the existing extension at no. 29 there would be no loss of light or overbearing impact as a result.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Windows in the east and west roof slope should be obscurely glazed and non opening except for 1.7 metres above finished floor level. No additional openings in the east of west elevation of the building or roof slope.
4. Flat roof shall not be used as a balcony or terrace.
5. Materials render and brick to match existing and light grey cedral cladding to the front and rear gables.

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

1. Proactive with amendments

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 4th April 2022

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 5 April 2022