expiry · 25·10

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0540/07 Recommendation - REFUSE

Site: 3 East Meadway Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5RF

Proposal: Part two-storey, part single-storey extension to rear

The Application

The application property is the westernmost house in a terrace of four on the south side of East Meadway. The house is single storey at the front with a ridged roof front projection, and two-storey at the rear with a side gable.

The proposal is for a part single-storey part two-storey rear extension with hipped roof. The two-storey section would occupy the west side of the rear elevation with the single-storey section infilling between the two-storey and the boundary. The two-storey section would be 3.7m wide by, 3.3m deep by, 6.4m high to the ridge of the roof. The single-storey section would be the same depth,1.85m in width and 2.85m in height.

The property attached to the east (No.5) is a similar styled house with rear single-storey, mono-pitch roof extension. The two further adjacent properties (No's 7 & 9) also have small rear extensions of similar design and depth. To the west is a detached bungalow with rear dormer and a converted detached garage used as a utility room on the eastern boundary. To the south are a pair of semi-detached houses.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: The owner of No.1 East Meadway has raised concerned about loss of light and loss of view. They feel the proposals should be of a lesser depth particularly at first floor.

The owner of 5 East Meadway does not wish to object to the proposed development, but they do have concerns regarding the loss of light, planting and the pruning of a tree.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (WSCC 2005): LOC1, DEV1, DEV4-5.
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7, and Appendix II ' Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

Planning Assessment

The main concerns with the application are the effects on the amenity of the neighbouring sites and visually how the proposals relate to the host dwelling.

Policies
Structure Plan policies seek to protect and, where possible enhance the character and distinctiveness of areas, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). 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 extensions on semi-detached or terraced properties that are within 1 metre of a side boundary with an attached dwelling should normally be no deeper than 2 metres. A rear extension should also allow the retention of garden area of at least 11 metres in depth. Two-storey extensions should also have a pitched roof to match the existing house.

Visual amenity
The existing house has a gable styled ridge roof with an eaves level which is at second storey at the rear of the property and at first floor to the front. The proposed hipped roof is considered to be unsympathetic in its design to that of the original property and would result in an incongruous addition.

The two-storey section is proposed to be 3.7m in width which would be more than half the width of the existing property. It would be tight up against the window in the first floor which would make it feel cramped and too dominant.

Residential amenity
Development Control Standard No.3 states the distance a two-storey extension should be if within 1.0m of the boundary with an attached property. The proposed two-storey section would be separated from the boundary by a distance of 1.9m which is considered enough to prevent the proposals from having an adverse effect on the outlook or amount of daylight available from the upper floor, rear windows of the attached property (No.5).

The detached property to the west is separated by 4.0m from the application house, but set back from the rear building line by approximately 1.0m. The proposed extension would result in the building projecting beyond the building line of No.1 by 4.3m at two-storey level. The detached rear utility room is sited against the boundary with the application property and would obscure a large percentage of the proposals from view from the rear of No.1. The first floor of the proposals would project over this utility and would be visible, but due to

the southern aspect of No.1 it is unlikely to have such an effect on sunlight as to warrant refusal on that basis alone, however the effect on the outlook would be diminished considerably.

The garden of the property is small being 7.0m in length as existing, with the houses directly to the south in Old Fort Road (No's 73a & 75) also have short rear gardens 8.5m long with an access path 1.5m separating the two. The proposed extension would reduce the length of the already small garden to 5.0m, which is considered to be unacceptably small resulting in their being an unacceptable level of overlooking of the properties to the south.

Recommendation

REFUSE for reason that :-

B5BR – amended.
The proposed extension, by reason of its large size and unsympathetic design, would be out of keeping in scale and appearance with the existing building and would detract to an unacceptable extent from the visual amenities and residential environment of the locality, resulting in loss of privacy and an overbearing effect on the adjacent property, contrary to the policies of the West Sussex Structure Plan (DEV1) and the Adur District Local Plan (AH7)

Case Officer: [signature]
Date: 16-10-07