Expiry Date – 17/3

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0042/17 Recommendation – Grant

Site: 18 Osborne Close, Sompting

Proposal: **Side extension with pitched roof over providing additional room in roof.**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 24.2

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a semi detached bungalow on the west side of Osborne Close in an established residential area of Sompting.

The property is at the southern end of this cul de sac. Osborne Close is largely made up of 1950's bungalows and there are bungalows behind in Western Road North and Edwin Close to the south. An infill development of 8, 2-storey houses is across the road at Nos. 11-27 (odd).

This particular pair of bungalows is front gabled on one half and flat fronted on the other, the application site in this case. This is a common feature of the west side of the Close and also in Osborne Drive. The site has a deeper front garden than other houses with vehicle access directly off the head of the cul de sac and a detached garage in the front garden. It has a long side garden parallel with the rear garden boundary of 7 Edwin Close and a short rear garden repeated in Western Road North.

Land slopes into the garden from the street and ground level is higher than in Western Road North by more than 1 metre. The property has been extended to the rear and a room formed in the original roofspace with rear Cabrio rooflights.

The site is not in a conservation area and is not listed. There are no protected trees on the site.

Proposal

Permission is sought to add a south side extension to within 1000mm of the boundary with 7 Edwin Close. The extension is set 100mm behind the front wall and has a hipped roof. It repeats the side gable of the original roof and extends to the original rear wall. Its dimensions are a maximum 4.7 metres in width, 7.975 metres in length with eaves and ridge lines just below that of the original bungalow.

The new side wall repeats the full gable feature of the existing side wall and includes a single window at ground floor level, to a bathroom. Other than the bathroom, a living room and bedroom are to be formed in the ground floor with outlook to the front and rear.

The extension provides one additional first floor bedroom with access from a second staircase which, according to the applicant, is necessary as head height in the new floorspace is unachievable from the existing staircase. The new bedroom accommodation is not accessible from the existing first floor bedroom. This new bedroom is lit by 2 front facing rooflights.

This application follows on from a refusal in November last year for a front/side extension and rear dormer. No pre-application advice was sought for this latest scheme.

Since the refusal a gate has been added to the front boundary wall behind the garage on site which opens on to highway grass verge in front of an alleyway to Edwin Close and 27 Osborne Close. The applicant has advised thus:

> 'With regard to the gates (which are within my boundary) We will require temporary site access for the digger machine as I do not wish to take down the garden wall to gain access. I will be negotiating the temporary site access with the County Council once we have obtained planning permission.'

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/1469/16 - Extension to south elevation with dormer to west roofslope and rooflights to (front) roofslope. Refused 28.11.16 for the following reason:

The proposed extensions by virtue of their design, size and position would result in an unneighbourly development which would be harmful to neighbours' living conditions due to loss of outlook, overbearing impact and overlooking and also the side extension's design, scale and position would be harmful to the balanced appearance, character and setting of this pair of bungalows and the wider streetscene The proposal is therefore contrary to saved Adur local plan policies AG1, AH2, and AH7 and Appendix 11 including Supplementary Planning Guidance comprising 'Development Control Standard No. 3 - Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings', emerging Adur local plan Policies 1, 2 and 15 and The National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

ADC/0222/08 - Two-bedroom bungalow (with room in roof) to side of existing dwelling. Refused 1.7.08 on the grounds;

The size of the plot would not permit development of a standard compatible with existing development in the area and in consequence the proposed dwelling would result in an unsatisfactory standard of living accommodation, constituting overdevelopment that would be out of keeping with and detrimental to the environmental character and residential amenities of the locality. It would fail to achieve high quality design and be contrary to the policies of the West Sussex Structure Plan (CH1, DEV1) and the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH2).

Consultations

Sompting Parish Council – *'Although the Council supports this application, they are concerned if the garden facing east was opened up, where the foliage acts as a screen at the moment.'*

Representations

Two objections summarized as follows:

1. The dormer window overlooks our bungalow. It is close proximity to our bathroom, bedroom and garden.

2. We are already overlooked by a rear rooflight and from their trampoline which is on the back garden boundary.

3. This will reduce daylight in the morning to 22 Western Road North

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012
Saved Local Plan policies AG1, AH2, AH5 and AH7 and Appendix 11 including Supplementary Planning Guidance comprising 'Development Control Standard No. 3 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.
Emerging Adur Local Plan Policies P1, P2 and P15

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development can be supported as it upgrades a dwelling within the built up area boundary.

Of chief consideration are the impacts of the proposal on neighbours and on the appearance of the property and the wider streetscene.

Policy Context

Development Control Standard No. 3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' includes saved Adur Local Plan policy AH7 and expands design advice for domestic extensions as follows:

'*Saved policy AH7 states:*

Extensions and alterations to existing houses and bungalows will be expected to be designed so that:-
(a) proposals would not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, loss of natural light or overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings;

(b) design and materials are sympathetic to both the original dwelling and the area in general;
(c) the proportion of the garden area taken by the proposal would not be excessive having regard to the character of the area;
(d) access and car parking provision is acceptable under Policy AT12, and
(e) proposals accord with the standards adopted by the District Planning

PLANNING PRINCIPLES

THE EFFECT ON NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES

2.2 Proposals will not be granted planning permission if they have an unacceptably adverse effect on neighbouring properties. The main detrimental effects could be related to:-

(i) Privacy
The proposal should not result in direct overlooking of rooms in neighbouring properties, nor excessive amounts of overlooking of garden areas.

(ii) Daylight
Any proposal should not reduce the daylight to neighbouring properties to an unacceptable extent.

(iii) Outlook
The fact that a neighbour may be able to see an extension would not in itself make a proposal unacceptable, the outlook of neighbouring properties should not be dominated by the extension since this could be overbearing and oppressive. However, the loss of a distant view would not normally be considered a valid reason for refusing an application.

2.3 The extent to which the above factors are affected will depend on the size and position of the extension, as well as its location and orientation relative to neighbouring properties. Clearly extensions to a large detached house or bungalow on a large plot are far less likely to affect neighbouring properties than ones to small terraced or semi-detached houses or bungalows. In addition a single-storey extension would be less likely to have an adverse effect on neighbouring properties than a two-storey extension, which would be more likely to reduce daylight to neighbouring properties and lead to problems of overlooking.

THE APPEARANCE

The most important basic principle is that any extension should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and street scene generally. In particular, the proposal should not be allowed to over-dominate the house or clash with its appearance.

2.6 The following principles should also help to ensure that the criteria discussed above are met:-
(a) Extensions should respect the architectural period and style of the existing dwelling and the area.
(b) External construction materials should match in colour and texture the materials of

the existing dwelling;
(c) Windows and other openings should be in scale with the extension and should be in line with and match the proportions and style of existing windows.
(d) On a dwelling with a pitched roof, extensions should also have a pitched (or lean-to) roof if they are visible from the street, from a public place, or are two-storey extensions;

3.0 STANDARDS FOR EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS

II. SIDE EXTENSIONS

3.7 Side extensions should be set back at least 1m from the side boundary. This is particularly important in the case of two-storey extensions since, if adjacent dwellings were both extended up to the side boundary, it would create a "terracing" effect which would destroy the existing character of the area. If the area is spacious in layout and the buildings are large, a space greater than 1m may well be necessary to avoid an appearance of overdevelopment and a cramped effect. There can also be problems of loss of daylight to adjoining properties.
3.8 Side extensions being 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. False mono-pitched facades are not acceptable on the front elevation only, they may occasionally be acceptable if they run around all sides of the extension. 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 and to avoid difficulty in matching wall and roof materials. Very wide side extensions should normally be avoided since they would usually be out of scale with the existing dwelling and spoil its proportions.
3.9 The criteria relating to principal windows (and in some circumstances the retention of rear gardens), described under 3.4 and 3.5 above in relation to rear extensions should also be applied in the case of side extensions.

This is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which states;

56. The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.

57. It is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes.

58. Local and neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Such policies should be based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics. Planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments:

●●will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;

●●establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit;
●●optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses (including incorporation of green and other public space as part of developments) and support local facilities and transport networks;
●●respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation;
●●create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; and
●●are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

60. Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

61. Although visual appearance and the architecture of individual buildings are very important factors, securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations. Therefore, planning policies and decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment.

64. Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Assessment

Neighbour amenity

Since the refusal last year the application has been revised and the proposed rear dormer removed. The side extension is smaller and sits fractionally behind the front wall. It no longer includes a gable forward of the frontage. It is well removed from the semi-detached neighbour at 16 and so will have no impact on them.

The side extension still runs very close to the side boundary with 7 Edwin Close, to within 1 metre of their rear garden boundary. The extended rear wall of 7 Edwin Close lines through with the original front wall of the application site and is only 4 metres off the shared boundary. The previous application was refused in part because it was considered that the extension would be overbearing to No. 7 and would materially harm their outlook. The scale of the side wall has been reduced in this latest application as it no longer extends forward of the front wall with the front gable feature removed and the rear dormer has also been removed. The neighbour at No. 7 has chosen not to object to this latest application.

It is considered that this reduction in scale would no longer cause a significantly overbearing impact or loss of outlook. The proposed side bathroom window will be obscurely glazed with a top hung opener only to avoid intrusion. A condition preventing further windows being added to the side wall is also recommended. .

2 occupiers in Western Road North, to the rear, have objected to this application on the grounds of overlooking from a rear dormer. This latest application does not include a rear dormer and so no greater overlooking will occur. The new first floor bedroom is to be lit from the front by 2 velux. Conditions preventing further roof extensions or alterations is recommended.

One of the objector's also refers to a loss of morning sunlight as a result of the extension. The application site is on higher ground than the properties to the rear, approximately 1 metre in difference, and both properties have short rear gardens. However these houses are approximately 15 metres apart and the proposed extension does not extend beyond the original rear wall. It is not considered that at this distance significant loss of light would occur and nor would the extension be overbearing.

To prevent further overlooking a condition is recommended restricting further extension or alterations.

Design/Streetscene

The extension is now proposed 100mm behind the main front wall where previously it was 700mm forward of the main front wall. The front gable is also removed and the new roof profile follows more closely that of the original house. It is slightly further off the side boundary. The extension will be less prominent in the streetscene as a result and would have less of an unbalancing impact. The property's position at the head of the cul de sac and the dense shrubbery in the front garden further minimise its impact on the streetscene.

Although much reduced, the rear garden retained would still be larger than others in the street.

The extension includes a second staircase. The applicant contends the existing staircase is inadequate and cannot be used to access the new roofspace bedroom. Previously the applicant has tried to get an end of terrace dwelling on this site and so there is concern that this unit will be sub divided, to the detriment of amenity. The applicant has previously advised that the ground floor is for his elderly father. A condition is recommended to ensure that the internal link between the existing house and the extension remains open and that separate external access is not created. Condition 4 will prevent a door being added to the side wall. Condition 6 ensures the internal access at ground floor is kept open. Condition 7 prevents the sub division of the remaining garden for separate use.

Conclusion

On balance it is considered that this revised application, subject to conditions, will not lead to significant harm to neighbours or to the appearance of the area.

Recommendation APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved Plans
2. 3 years

3. Materials to Match
4. No new side windows/doors
5. Side bathroom window obscure and only openable 1.7 metre off finished floor level
6. Ground floor link kept open
7. No sub division of the garden
8. PD removed for further extensions and garden outbuildings.
9. Hours of working Mon- Sat 8am to 6pm only

Informative

1. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? Y

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 15.3.17
Authorised and signed by:	PD	Date: 15.3.17