Expires 20/11/07.

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0594/07 **Recommendation – Permit Application**

Site: **3 Kingston Way Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 6YA**

Proposal: **Single-storey side and rear extensions**

The Application

The application site is a detached bungalow located on the south side of Kingston Way, Shoreham. The property forms part of a street of identical bungalows and features no previous additions other than a rear east side garage.
This proposal seeks permission to erect a large single storey rear extension that will be 7.3 metres in depth and 11 metres in width. It will be mainly flat roofed with a rear pitched facade however the western roof segment is to be a hipped pitch continuing the lines of the main bungalow roof, the rear part of which will be entirely glazed. It will sit 1 metre off the western boundary and across to the eastern boundary with rear doors and windows serving an enlarged kitchen/diner and lounge. The existing garage is to be demolished to make way for this addition. Additionally, a large east side mono pitched porch addition will be added, set back from the front elevation, with a floor area of 9 square metres.
This scheme follows on from two similar proposals approved under SU/203/01/TP and SU/266/02/TP, the latter of which was for a flat roofed 'L' shaped construct 5.8 metres deep and 11 metres in width that followed a similar footprint to this proposal.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties

No.2 Kingston Way Object on the grounds of the proposal being overdevelopment of the site and out of keeping with the neighbouring bungalows.

Contributors

No representations have been received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005): LOC1, DEV1
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved until adoption of the new Adur Development Plan): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'

Planning Assessment

Policies
Structure Plan policies seek to protect, and where possible, enhance the character and distinctiveness of an area, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general.

Visual Amenity
The main bulk of the extension will be located to the rear of the bungalow and out of sight from the street. The porch addition to the east side elevation will sit 1.2 metres off the front elevation, level with the neighbouring dwelling (No.2), and directly onto the eastern boundary. It will have a pitched facade on all sides with the frontal section overhanging the door to form a canopy. Given the porch's location set back to the side and its sympathetic design it will not form an incongruous feature within the uniformity of the street.

Residential Amenity
The rear extension will potentially impact on both neighbours due to its bulk and roof form. To the east it will sit 0.1 metres off the boundary with a flat roof and rear pitched facade. It will arguably have less impact on No.2 than is currently afforded by the garage as the new structure will be of the same height but 1.5 metres less in depth. A front window is proposed facing down the former driveway that will not impact on the privacy of the obscurely glazed bathroom side windows of No.2.
To the west the pitched roof will continue along the lines of the main bungalow 7.2 metres to the rear, the rear 4.2 metres of which is to be hipped and glazed to create a conservatory. The pitched roof form will not cause loss of light to the side bathroom and kitchen windows to No.4 as it will continue the slope of the main roof. The large depth along this flank will be disguised somewhat by the pitched garage to No.4 thus minimising any oppressive impact the extension could have on the rear outlook of this property. The west flank wall will feature high level windows beneath the glazed roof section and a full window adjacent to the main bungalow. This window will serve the enlarged lounge area but will afford views between the rear elevation and garage of No.4. Although it is technically the main window to the lounge, the glazed conservatory roof will provide the majority of light into the room. This side

window can therefore be conditioned to be obscurely glazed to protect No.4's privacy.
The front side porch will be built onto the boundary but level with the front elevation of No.2. It will not impact on light to the side bathroom windows of this property.
A distance of 20 metres will separate the rear elevation of the proposal and that of 8 Franklin Road to the rear, less than the 22 metres recommended by the DC Standard. No overlooking will occur though as 2 metre high boundary fencing and taller shrubs act as a suitable barrier.

Other Issues
Although it is clear that the extension is very large in scale compared to the main bungalow, it is considered to be acceptable given that its floor area of 76.5 square metres is only marginally greater than the floor area of the previous approved rear extension SU/266/02/TP (70 square metres). A good sized garden are will remain which, at 102 square metres, sits well above the minimum 85 square metres recommended by the Council's DC Standard as the minimum for properties of this size.
The concerns of No.2 are noted however given the above statistics it is not considered that the extension will prove to be overdevelopment of a significant degree to warrant refusal. Whilst it is acknowledged that the extension is unusually large compared to the minor additions elsewhere in the street it will only be moderately noticeable to the immediate neighbours. Additionally, given the two previous approvals for extensions of similar size, a refusal on the grounds of overdevelopment would be unreasonable.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPi

Subject to:

1. C1Ci
2. C12Ei
3. C18Civ: '...The windows in the west side elevation...'
4. C18Eii: '...in the east ~~and~~ or west side walls...of the extensions hereby...

Case Officer:..... Date:..1/11/07..

Planning Services Manager:..... Date:...9/11/07...

Planning & Regulatory Committee Chairman:..A.J. Mills Date:...19/11/07