Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1076/22 Recommendation: APPROVE

Site: 12 Fairfield Close, Shoreham-by-Sea

Proposal: Ground floor rear extension, hip to gable roof extension with window in new side gable, rear dormer with Juliet balcony and front rooflights.

Date of Site Visit: 26th July 2022

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional neighbour notification: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings:

The application site is a hipped roof semi detached bungalow with a rear conservatory within a cul de sac of similar properties.

Consent was originally sought for a hip to gable roof extension, rear flat roof extension with juliet balcony and front roof lights. The dormer was large and was not set in from the side gable and extended further than the existing eaves. Weathered cedar cladding was proposed to be on the side gable, dormer and rear extension. Officers considered that the dormer was too large and needed to be set in and set back on the roof slope away from the gable and rear extension. Amended plans have been received which show this reduction and set in giving separation between the dormer and the side gable, the dormer does not sit onto the rear extension.

Representations

1 representation received from the owner/occupier of no. 2 Hammy Close: -

- Loss of privacy due to juliette balcony overlooking gardens to rear.
- The roof of the rear extension could become a terrace.

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 hip to gable extension will be clearly visible within the street scene. There are many other examples of hip to gable extensions within the street and dormers to the front and rear create a varied character here. There are also examples of different materials, such as cladding and different window colours and the use of render, again creating variation within the street scene.

The changes proposed therefore are considered to not be out of keeping in this case. The design in this case gives a contemporary appearance and finish whilst respecting the existing character. The rear dormer now set in from the side gable and reduced in scale still represents a large addition however there are other large scale dormers visible within the street scene. It should also be noted that under permitted development a large rear dormer could be constructed without planning consent.

The single storey flat roof extension again represents similar development nearby and is in keeping in scale with the existing bungalow.

Residential amenity

The main properties to be affected are those either side of the site. The hip to gable will be seen from those opposite however there will be no adverse impact in this case. The single storey extension is 2.6 metres in depth, the attached bungalow has a glazed extension set away from the boundary therefore the adjacent windows will be within a recess, however on balance this is acceptable due to the south facing aspect, the limited depth of the proposed extension and the existing extension at the attached property being glazed and light weight.

To the east there is a rear conservatory set in from the boundary, there will be no adverse impact here, due to the spacing between the buildings. There is a window proposed in the side gable which will serve a landing, this will be obscurely glazed to protect the amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling and to not preclude any future development next door.

An objection has been received from the occupiers of the dwelling directly to the rear of the site. This neighbouring bungalow has an existing dormer window which faces onto the rear of the application site. This distance is in excess of 22 metres therefore

there would be no justification to refuse the application in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy. It is noted that the juliette balconies give rise to a full height window therefore greater overlooking yet these could be installed in principle under permitted development with a similar impact. The neighbour also expressed concern with regards to the accessing of the flat roof from the first floor. A condition is attached to ensure this is not the case.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials as shown on the plans to include cedar cladding and anthracite windows and doors.
4. No additional windows on the east or west elevation of the building.
5. The landing window on the east side gable shall be obscurely glazed and high level opening only.
6. No use of the flat roof as a terrace/balcony.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation Y

1. Proactive, amended plans received.

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 5th September 2022

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 5 September 2022