Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1413/20 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 17 Windlesham Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Proposed single storey side/rear extensions

Date of site visit: 13th October 2020

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a semi detached two storey dwelling within a street of similar properties combined with bungalows of various design. The application site has parking to the front with a single storey extension set back to the side and rear. The extension is visible as a garage when viewed from the front. It however comprises a utility, kitchen family room, workshop and garage. Consent was originally sought for a single storey extension which wrapped around the side and rear of the dwelling house. Set forward of the existing front elevation extending in line with the main part of the rear extension and set in by 1.1 metres from the boundary. The projection from the rear elevation was 5.9 metres. The plans showed a garage and utility to the front/side and a kitchen dining area to the rear.

Officers sought amendments as the plans as submitted could not be supported. Amended plans were received which showed a depth of 3.5 metres (measured from the joint rear projection on the boundary) at the nearest point to the boundary of the attached dwelling stepping out to 5.9 metres, 5 metres away from the boundary. The extension has a half hipped roof design and roof lanterns are proposed which are recessed. Bifold doors face onto the rear garden.

Representations

Representation received from owner/occupiers of no. 15 Windlesham Road on both original and amended plans: -

Original Plans

- The extension almost twice the size of the existing one will be extremely close to our shared boundary and its scale and bulk will be out of keeping with the design and character of the rest of the property. It will be overbearing and intrusive.
- The dark grey windows and doors is out of character with those in the rest of the property
- It appears that the large skylights in the roof will project above the tiled roof and clearly visible.
- Overlooking loss of privacy.

- Loss of light, overshadow the patio and cut off light to living room and south facing dining room.
- Loss of views and amenity.

Amended Plans

- Disappointed that the 3.5 metres cannot be taken from the rear wall of the main house.
- If the extension could be moved away from the boundary wall it would lessen the overbearing nature.
- On balance we have no objection to the installation of 2 side windows provided they are non-opening with sand blasted obscure glass.
- A possible reduction in height and the sky lights being recessed would be welcomed.
- Concern with regards to privacy as a result of the raised patio. A fence should be provided to restore some privacy. Also confirmation that the existing shrubs and bushes along the line of the fence will remain for additional screening.

A representation has also been made from the owner/occupier of no. 19 Windlesham Road requesting that the side door that opens onto their bathroom window is moved to be opening onto a blank wall.

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 (February 2019)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

The side addition is visible within the street scene and is replacing a building of similar form. An attached garage will be visible adjacent to the main house. It will be the width of the existing extension however set forward by 2.7 metres. Despite it being set further forward than existing it will still be significantly set back from the front elevation of the main house. Therefore appearing subservient when viewed within the street scene. There will be no greater impact here than currently exists.

The rear addition as amended is not overly large and taking into consideration the footprint of the existing extensions it is in keeping in scale with the existing dwelling.

Materials will be brick and render to match existing. Grey door and window frames are proposed which is not considered to be harmful in this case.

Residential amenity

The side addition will be visible from dwellings opposite the site however there will be no loss of light or privacy as a result. The main properties to be affected are those either side of the site. No. 19 the bungalow to the west and the attached dwelling no. 15 to the east. Both owner/occupiers have made representations.

The reduction in depth of the extension adjacent to the boundary of the attached dwelling to 3.5 metres (beyond the rear of the joint projection) is in line with the Council's Development Management Standard and therefore is not considered to result in any significant loss of light or overbearing impact to the adjacent occupiers. It is noted here that although the extension as amended is 4.3 metres extending from the rear wall of the house, when taking into account the joint rear projection which is on the boundary, 3.5 metres is taken from this point. The impact relative to the neighbouring property is therefore the same as a 3.5 metres deep extension. There is also a set in from the boundary of 1.1 metres to increase separation. There is a patio window adjacent to the boundary and also a rear extension with west facing windows set away from the boundary at no. 15. This room will have views toward the side of the proposed extension. However with the reduction in depth and set in there is no adverse impact in this case that would warrant a refusal. The roof lights have also been recessed to limit the height of the extension when viewed from the neighbouring property.

The proposed plans show glazing on the side elevation, these are shown to be obscurely glazed and non-opening. A condition is attached to ensure that this is the case. To protect the amenities of the adjacent occupiers.

The plans also show a raised patio to the rear of the extension. The amended plans show a new boundary fence 1.8 metres high to offer privacy between properties as a result of this raised ground level. It is considered sensible to allow the neighbours to agree a suitable solution and height here and this is also conditioned. The neighbours requested that shrubs be retained on the boundary however such matters cannot be enforced and the fencing would offer the required mutual privacy.

The bungalow to the west is, as existing, adjacent to the side elevation of the extension. There is a bathroom window along the side facing onto the boundary. The garage door is the only opening along this side of the extension, it is conditioned to be of solid design to retain the privacy of the adjacent occupier. The extension will otherwise have no greater impact than existing upon the neighbouring bungalow.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans

2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials to match existing
4. The windows on the east side elevation of the extension hereby permitted shall be obscurely glazed and non openable (as shown on the approved plans) and shall remain as such at all times.
5. The garage door on the west elevation of the extension hereby approved shall be of solid construction and design and shall remain as such at all times.
6. No additional openings on the east and west side of the extensions.
7. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans prior to use of the raised patio hereby permitted the applicants shall agree with the occupiers of no. 15 the height of the boundary fence to be erected and the fence shall remain in place at all times. The boundary treatment shall offer screening and privacy to both parties.

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

1. Proactive with amendments

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 5th November 2020

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 5 November 2020