Expiry Date - 27/12/2010

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0422/10 **Recommendation – Permit Application**

Site: **29 Slonk Hill Road Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 6HX**

Proposal: **Hip-roofed rear extension and raised decking (existing conservatory removed)**

The Application

The application property is a detached bungalow located on the south side of Slonk Hill Road. It has a conservatory and raised decking at the rear. The garden slopes steeply down to the south. It is proposed to remove the conservatory and decking and to construct a single storey rear extension measuring 4.2m deep, 7.4m wide (the full width of the dwelling) and 5.7m high. It will have a hipped roof with rooflights on all three sides to provide light into the ground floor room. A raised access platform is proposed to run along part of the west side and south (rear) elevation. This has been reduced in size from the originally proposed decking and measures 0.7m above ground level and 1m deep.

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

None

Third Parties

3 letters received from the occupiers of 31 Slonk Hill Road, 70 & 72 Downside objecting to the original application for the following reasons:

- Raised decking would be invasive and cause unacceptable degree of overlooking and loss of privacy.
- Extension will be a substantial height above ground level due to slope of garden and will also cause overlooking, particularly if existing shrubs are removed
- Set a precedent

1 letter received from the occupier of 27 Slonk Hill Road stating he has no objection to the proposals

Expiry Date - 27/12/2010

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993 – 2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies

Policy AH7 refers to residential extensions but the principles are the same when considering extensions to non-residential buildings. It 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. The proportion of the garden area taken up by a proposal should not be excessive.

Government policy is set out in Planning Policy Statement PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development'. Relevant paragraphs are 17, which refers to the commitment to protecting and improving the environment; 18 which states that planning should seek to maintain and improve the local environment and help to mitigate the effects of declining environmental quality through positive policies on issues such as design; and 34 which states that good design is indivisible from good planning and that design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area, should not be accepted.

Visual amenity and character

The extension has been designed to continue the ridge line of the existing dwelling, but with a hipped roof to reduce its bulk. The internal floor level of the extension will be raised above the garden level as a result of the slope but the extension is not considered to be unduly dominant or overbearing in its appearance.

Residential amenity

The main objections to the original plans were to the raised decking proposed to run along part of the rear elevation of the extension and to the possible overlooking which would result. The plans have been amended to remove this element and the decking has now been replaced with a smaller 'access platform' to enable access to and from the patio doors at the rear. Such a

feature is considered to be necessary due to the difference in levels from the floor of the extension to the garden below.

The platform will only be 1m deep and is unlikely to be used as conventional decking; rather it will be a means of access to the and from the rear of the building. On this basis it is not considered that the proposal will result in overlooking or a loss of amenity for adjoining occupiers in Slonk Hill Road, or for those in Downside at the rear. It should also be noted that the proposed platform is at a lower level than the existing decking.

The extension will have high level windows on both sides and full length patio doors and a window on the rear. These will enable views to the south but the rear windows of the dwellings in Downside are some 35m away which exceeds the usual 22m distance in the DC Standard. There is a distance of only 6.5m to the rear garden boundary but there are a number of shrubs and trees on both sides of the boundary which help to provide some screening. Overlooking of the end of the 29m long garden is, in any event, not considered to be a sufficient reason to refuse the application, particularly as the existing conservatory and decking at No.29 come to about the same depth as the proposed extension and there should therefore be no significant worsening of the relationship between dwellings.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that:-

1PPi

Subject to:

1. C1Ci
2. C12Ei
3. This permission relates to the following approved plans date stamped received 10 December 2010:
   Dwg 1010/00 Rev. 1 (Site Plan and Block Plan), Dwg 1010/002 Rev. 1 (Proposed Floor Layout), Dwg 1010/003 Rev 1 (Proposed Elevations)
   Reason– For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning

Case Officer Peter Barnett Date 22 December 2010