Expiry Date – 11/8/14

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0764/14 Recommendation – Approve

Site: 19 Slonk Hill Road, Shoreham

Proposal: **Rear single storey extension with raised terrace and steps.**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a detached bungalow on the south side of Slonk Hill Road built in the early 1970's. The property has been extended at the rear with an 'L' shaped conservatory.

Slonk Hill Road is built on land considerably higher than the houses at Downside and on sloping ground. They have short rear gardens which are well below internal floor level height, by approximately 1.5 metres. The application site has an 'L' shaped conservatory which is deeper on its west side with a raised terrace beyond it where the applicant currently sits and dines. There is also a platform beyond the garage on the east side.

Planning permission is sought to remove the 'L' shaped conservatory and terrace on the west side and to replace them with a square conservatory measuring 4 metres in depth (700mm deeper than the existing) and 4.275 metres in width and to create a central terrace by extending the floor area of the conservatory to be removed in this area by 1 metre in depth. This extra depth does not include the curved steps which exist beyond the existing conservatory. These steps currently facilitate a view south and are also to be removed.

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

Relevant Planning History

None.

Consultations

None undertaken.

Representations

Two objections received from the occupiers of 58 and 60 Downside summarized as follows:

1. Increased overlooking. Fence is only 2 to 3 feet above height of proposed terrace and ¾ of a person will be visible above the fence and loom large over us (58).
2. The extension will have the same effect but at least occupiers will be indoors and will not seem part of our garden.
3. Without the tree foliage there is an uninterrupted view into the garden at 58 Downside.
4. There is a 9 foot ground floor level difference between the site and No.60 and as such I will be overlooked.
5. The new central terrace formed from the existing conservatory slab and extended in depth will be higher than the terrace to be removed and will greatly overlook No. 60, particularly as the terrace level will be less than three feet below the fence line. .
6. I do not think the impact from the central terrace to be created is balanced by the removal of the existing terrace as this principally overlooks No. 62.
7. I also do not think the replacement extension should extend 1 metre closer to the fence.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012
Policies AG1 and AH7 of the Adur Local Plan 1996
Development Control Standard 3 – Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings

Planning Assessment

Principle

Extensions to dwellings in established residential areas will generally be acceptable where they do not lead to harm to neighbours and are acceptable in design terms.

<u>Neighbour Amenity</u>

Policy AH7 of the Adur Local Plan requires extensions 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;

Development Control Standard No. 3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’ on the subject of privacy states:-

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

In the same guidance reference is made to balconies. The terrace proposed is akin to a balcony and the guidance states ‘the addition of a balcony to a property anywhere near

the boundary would be likely to lead to problems of overlooking. Balconies on terraced or semi-detached properties will therefore usually be resisted.'

Two neighbours of Downside, to the south, have objected to this proposal on the grounds of increased overlooking and subsequent loss of privacy. Downside houses sit at a considerably lower level and their gardens are tiered up towards the rear garden boundary shared with Slonk Hill Road. Downside gardens are in the region of 30 metres in length. The site garden is about 4 metres deep centrally.

The proposed extension is on the west side of the rear elevation. It replaces an existing conservatory. It is 1 metre deeper than the existing conservatory and squares it of in this area adding 1 metre in width in an easterly direction. The existing terrace beyond this closest to the boundary with No. 21 Slonk Hill Road is to be removed and the garden in this reinstated to its original, much lower, level. I do not consider that significant additional overlooking will occur to any neighbour from the proposed extension. I consider the removal of the terrace on the boundary with No. 21 and 60/62 Downside will remove direct boundary overlooking to all, though 62 is screened from it by dense tree planting within their own garden.

The extension is well designed and acceptable on this rear elevation. The high level west facing windows can be fixed and obscurely glazed to avoid overlooking as this room has windows on two other sides and roof lanterns.

This leaves the central terrace to be created from the return of the deck of the conservatory to be removed and its extension by 1 metre in depth. This terrace will be clearly visible to No. 60 Downside particularly, No. 58 also and potentially 62 Downside and more apparent from 58 and 60 than the terrace to be removed. Much of it will exist once the conservatory is removed as it is formed from the base of it and so overlooking from this limited terrace would occur. For consideration is whether the terrace to be formed in this area should be extended in depth by 1 metre thereby making it a more useable, and more likely used, square terrace in a more sensitive position closer to the boundary with Downside properties.

In my view the removal of the terrace from the west side which currently extends to the rear garden boundary and allows views over the garden of No. 60 and would allow views over 62's garden were it not for 62's planting of a dense tree screen is an improvement for these neighbours. It's relocation, in effect, to a more central position but off the shared boundary by 3 metres is no more harmful to neighbours. Overlooking will reoccur and it is open to neighbours to plant or erect screening if desired. Additional screening cannot easily be erected on the site and the resident at No. 60 advised on site that she did not want to see the boundary fence increased in height.

I do not consider the extent of overlooking that will result to be excessive and on balance recommend this application for approval.

Recommendation

Approve subject to the following conditions:

1. 3 years

2. Approved plans
3. Materials to match
4. West facing windows fixed and obscure

Informatives

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: 7.8.14

Authorised and signed by: Gary Peck Date: 11 August 2014