Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0384/15 Recommendation – REFUSE

Site: 39 Saxons, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Part two storey and part single storey extension to rear (east) elevation.

Date of site visit: 14.04.15

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is located within north Shoreham, a semi-detached, two storey dwelling within a cul-de-sac of similar properties. The application site is on high ground level raising from south to north. Mill Avenue to the south is at a lower ground level. The surrounding locality comprises of residential dwellings.

The proposal seeks planning permission for a part two storey and part single storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling. There is an existing front, flat roof projection which forms an original feature. This along with the southern elevation has been rendered in white with the remainder of the building being brick. There is also an existing conservatory to the rear. There is a front driveway which is on higher ground level than the highway, ground level also increasing from the east. The application site therefore has a prominent setting, also being the first dwelling on the eastern side when entering the cul-de-sac.

It is proposed that the existing conservatory is to be removed and a single storey extension is proposed the full width of the house to a depth of 3.9 metres. Above part of the ground floor extension a first floor addition is proposed. This element is 3.8 metres wide and 3.9 metres deep. A hipped roof is proposed to a maximum height of 6.4 metres. The extension will provide an enlarged kitchen diner at ground floor and an additional bedroom and ensuite at first floor.

Consultations:

none

Representations: An objection has been received from the owner/occupier of no. 38 Saxons the attached dwelling to the north. The following comments have been made: -

We are not against the single storey addition.
The two storey extension would impose on our privacy and light to our house.
The view to the south from the back bedroom will be severely restricted.

There are no other semi detached houses in this street that have two storey extensions and this would set a precedent.

An objection has also be raised from the owner/occupier of no. 75 Downsway stating that a 4 metre extension in the space available is gross over development. If the original builders thought it enough space I am sure they would have built a 4 bedroom house in the first place.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising:
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012).

Planning Assessment

Principle

There is no objection in principle to the proposed development which involves an extension to an existing dwelling house. However the issues for consideration here are the impact of the proposed development on the visual amenity of the locality, street scene and existing dwelling and the impact upon the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings.

Visual amenity

As stated above the application site is prominent due to the raised ground level increasing from the south to north and west to east. It is also the first house of the eastern side of the cul de sac therefore there are prominent views of the side of the dwelling from lower ground level to the south from the highway and adjacent dwellings. The proposed first floor extension will therefore be clearly visible and due to its scale and size it is considered to dominate the existing building. The plans as submitted show the extension at first floor to be overly large, it does not relate in scale to the existing modest dwelling. The extension will therefore not be subordinate in this case. There is concern that should this proposal be granted then this would give way to similar form of development within this cul de sac of matching modest style dwellings. This would result in overdevelopment which would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the locality as a whole.

The single storey extension at the depth shown at 3.9 metres and the full width of the dwelling is considered to be acceptable in this case. Although large in scale it is partly replacing an existing conservatory and ample garden space will still remain. This element can be considered to be subservient in this case.

Amended plans have been received which show the extension to be rendered with a tiled roof (the original plans showed cladding at first floor) the rendered finish will match the existing side elevation and due to its light appearance in this case is considered acceptable. However in the light of the concerns over scale and

prominence it could be seen to increase the prominence of the first floor addition when viewing from lower ground level and within the surround area.

Residential amenity

The ground floor extension abuts the boundary with the attached dwelling to the north. As existing this adjacent dwelling has a ground floor brick and tile extension abutting the boundary approximately 4 metres in depth. The proposed ground floor extension at the application site is a similar depth with no side windows to be affected therefore there will be no loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact as a result of the ground floor extension.

The submitted plans show the first floor addition to not impact on the adjacent first floor window at no. 38 with regards to loss of light, a 45 degree line is shown. This is accepted. The Council's adopted Development Control Standard no. 3 makes reference to first floor extensions within 1 metre of the boundary not exceeding 2 metres in depth. In this case there is 2.9 metres to the boundary and the extension is 3.9 metres in depth. It is considered that the outlook to this adjacent bedroom is significantly impacted by the proposed extension due to its large depth and limited distance from the boundary. Although loss of view is not a planning consideration the outlook and aspect to the south will be greatly impacted. The extension will be an unneighbourly and imposing form of development both to the adjacent attached dwelling and the adjacent dwellings on lower ground to the south whose gardens are limited in depth and abut the side of the site. Their rear aspect and outlook will also be affected, on balance to an unacceptable degree.

The planning officer suggested a reduction to the scheme as submitted. To reduce the first floor addition by 1 metre in depth and 0.4 metres in width, the ground floor extension was considered to be acceptable as submitted. This would allow for an additional bedroom to be achieved at first floor however the en-suite would be lost. It is considered that this reduction would be acceptable to allow for the extension to be more in keeping in scale with the existing building. And should other dwellings seek to replicate this form of development at this reduced scale the harm would be limited and on balance considered to be acceptable. The applicant advised that they did not wish to reduce the scheme and would seek to appeal a refusal.

Recommendation

REFUSE

1. The proposed extension by reason of its large size would be out of keeping in scale and appearance with the existing building. It would result in an unneighbourly form of development which would restrict outlook and aspect to the adjacent dwellings and is therefore detrimental to the visual and residential amenities of the locality. If permitted the Local Planning Authority would find it difficult to resist further similar proposals related to other dwellings within the cul-de-sac, the cumulative effect of which would spoil the existing character and appearance of the area resulting in overdevelopment. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policy AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan and the NPPF.

Informative

1. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to resolve those matters within the timescale allocated for the determination of this planning application. However, the Local Planning Authority has clearly set out, within its report, the steps necessary to remedy the harm identified within the reasons for refusal - which may lead to the submission of a more acceptable proposal in the future. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

2. For avoidance of doubt this refusal relates to the following drawings/plans:-

Drawing no. 05 Block and Location plan existing- received 16th March 2015
Plans and elevations as proposed - received 27th April 2015

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 5th May 2015

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 06.05.2015