Expiry Date - 01/07/2010

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0164/10 **Recommendation – Refuse Application**

Site: **81 Old Fort Road Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5HA**

Proposal: **Flat-roofed two-storey east side extension**

The Application

The application is the resubmission for a two-storey side extension that had been previously refused (ADC/0323/09) on the grounds that :-

01. 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 and thereby conflict with the policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7).

02. The proposed extension, by reason of its large size and unneighbourly design and siting, would be detrimental to the residential amenities of the locality, resulting in loss of privacy and an overbearing effect on the adjoining property, contrary to the policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AH7).

The application relates to a detached two-storey house built in 1919 located on the north side of Old Fort Road. The existing dwelling is a large detached house with a hipped roof, tiled in glazed cobalt-blue roof tiles. To the east side is a two-storey extension which makes up part of the east side boundary with the adjacent bungalow (No. 83), also tiled in the distinctive tile. Currently the dwelling has a balcony across the whole of its front elevation which increases in depth over the front entrance portico.

The current proposals would be for a two-storey side extension. It would be 2.0m in width, by 5.4m in depth, by 5.1m in height. The proposals would be a painted render finish to match the existing building with a flat roof, surrounded by decorative pilasters to match in profile those of the front balcony. The proposed extension would be used as a living room extension at ground floor, and additional bedroom accommodation at first floor. Windows would serve the first floor bedroom extension in the east side and front (south elevation, and at ground floor the living rooms extension would also be served with a window in the east elevation and an arched widow to the front. Both sets of windows facing eastwards are proposed to be fixed shut and obscurely glazed.

Permission was granted for a single-storey side extension with a pitched roof to match the existing distinctive tiled roof. (ADC/0413/09)

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: The owners of the adjacent bungalow to the east No.83 have objected to the proposals. They have reservations that the proposals will result in a loss of natural light, and if there is access to the flat roof, east balcony that their privacy would be invaded by being overlooked. They note that the obscured glass in the windows would mean they are not overlooked. They also feel that there will be a problem with the foundations of the extension, and how this may affect their property.

[NB: The owners of No. 83 wish to speak at the committee meeting]

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.'
PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies

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 side extensions should be set back at least 1m from the side boundary to prevent a 'terracing' effect should the neighbour wish to erect a similar extension. It also states that side extensions that are clearly visible from the road should be designed to closely match the existing dwelling. In particular they should have a roof in keeping with the existing dwelling which in most cases, will mean a pitched roof. The extension should usually be set back slightly from the main front wall of the dwelling to create a visual break and ensure the extension is subordinate to the main dwelling.

Visual amenity

The current plans have been scaled down from the former refused proposals (ADC/0323/09). Currently they show that the two-storey side extension would be located set in from the existing boundary wall by a distance of 1m, and set back from the main front wall in a subordinate fashion, by 0.1m and from the projecting balcony by 1.7m.

The proposals do represent an improvement in terms of their scale from that of the original application, and they would have less of an effect on the neighbouring dwelling and the streetscene as a whole, however with specific regards to how well the flat-roof of the extension would match the design of the original dwelling, it is considered that it would clearly still be an incongruous feature. It is noted that the arched ground floor front window would help integrate the extension into the design of the original house, however the pilaster surround to the flat roof would only further accentuate how unsympathetic the roof form would be.

Although the extension would be subordinate in its size the two-storey extension would still clearly be cramped within the space between the existing dwelling, the boundary and the front of the existing rear/side extension. The loss of the natural separation of the house at first-storey level would result in the dwelling from appearing overly cramped within the site.

Residential amenity
The proposed extension would have two pairs of windows in the eastern elevation facing directly towards No.83. It is proposed that these windows would be obscurely glazed and fixed shut. Therefore no loss of privacy would occur through overlooking.

Sunlight
The bungalow to the east is diminutive in scale and has a driveway to its west, with a single garage to the rear of the property, and two sets of windows with a western outlook. The owner of No.83 has objected on the grounds of loss of sunlight. As with the former application the bulk of the extension would be located between the objectors property and the existing two storey building to the west. In this case the extension would not project beyond the existing building lines, and it is therefore considered that there would be no adverse effect on the amount of natural daylight available.

Overbearing effect
The main concern with the former refused application was the added overbearing effect that would be felt by the occupiers of the neighbouring bungalow to the east (No.83). The current submission does show a more subordinate extension that would be set in from the boundary, it would not project forward of the building line. The side elevation of the extension would have a similar appearance to that of the side of the existing dwelling, and given that it would no longer create a single flank wall making up the boundary, it is considered that, on balance, the proposals would not result in an overbearing effect on the neighbouring house.

Other matters
The effect of extension on the foundations of the neighbouring site would be a civil matter covered by legislation in the Party Wall etc Act 1996, rather than being a material consideration for this application.

Expiry Date - 01/07/2010

Recommendation

REFUSE for reason that :-

01 The proposed extension, by reason of its large size and unsympathetic flat roofed 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 and thereby conflict with the policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7).

Case Officer Carlos Hone Date 26.05.10 RB 27/5