Exp 24/7

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0295/08 **Recommendation - Application Permitted**

Site: **41 Hill Farm Way, Southwick**

Proposal: **Side extension (including garage and enlarged rooms in roof with second front dormer and enlarged rear dormer)**

The Application

This is a revised and reduced submission following the refusal of the previous application for a larger proposal (ADC/0002/08).
The application property is the eastern half of a pair of semi-detached bungalows located on the northern side of Hill Farm Way. The proposal is to demolish the existing east side detached garage, and replace it with a hip-roofed side extension including a garage with rooms in the roof including a second front dormer and a rear dormer extension. There would be a small flat-roofed protrusion from the rear part of the east side (where the garage now stands).

The surrounding area is characterised by semi-detached bungalows of a similar age and design, many of which have front flat-roofed dormers. To the east (No's 43 – 61) are 10 pairs of semi-detached bungalows which are gable ended. The attached property (No.39) has not been extended and sits on a lower ground level. To the east there is a gap of 12m between the application property and its neighbour (No.43). An unusual relationship exists between the sites of No's 41 & 43 because the side boundary runs obliquely towards the highway, giving the front of No.41 a much narrower frontage than that of No.43.

The existing bungalow has previously been extended with a rear single-storey extension and attached rear conservatory, both built under permitted development, and rooms in the roof with a hip to gable extension with front and rear dormers. It has not been built in accordance with the approved plans but it is now too late to take enforcement action.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: A letter has been received from a surveyor on behalf of the neighbour at No.43, not raising an objection in principle but commenting that about the quality of the submitted plans (including lack of dimensions and accuracy) and expressing concern about the bulk and mass so close to her property, reduction in daylighting to her side entrance and rooms, overlooking and loss of privacy, and stating that the design is ugly and not in keeping with the quite attractive streetscene. It is stated that the close proximity of the extension to the boundary could damage the objector's wall and the sewer connection serving the10 bungalows to the east.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (WSCC 2005): DEV1, DEV4-5.
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

Structure Plan policies seek to protect and, where possible enhance the character and distinctiveness of areas, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). 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 'Extension and Alteration to Dwellings' states that the most important basic principle is that any extension should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and street scene generally. In particular, the proposal should not be allowed to over-dominate the house or clash with its appearance. Dormers should not be so large that they overdominate the dwelling, resulting in a top heavy 'box-like' appearance, and a sufficient amount of the original roof should still be clearly visible.

Residential amenity

The proposed side extension would not have any windows in the side elevation and would therefore not impact the privacy of the adjacent bungalow (No.43). The rear (flat-roofed part) of the extension would be no closer to the east side boundary than the existing garage and the front corner of the extension would at its closest be approximately 1.5m from that boundary (which is at an oblique angle). There would be a gap of 7m between the main part of the extension and the neighbouring bungalow (No.43).
The east side boundary is made up of a hedge approximately 5m high which has been partially removed at the front. The hedge may be further removed but it is considered that the effect would be acceptable. There is no necessity to interfere with the retaining wall and, in any event, the construction of foundations and protection of drains/sewer connections is a Building Regulations matter.

Visual amenity

The property has previously been extended with a hip to gable roof extension permitted under planning approval SW/81/92, in which the matter of the unbalancing of the pair of semi-detached properties was considered to be

acceptable. However, the side elevation does not accord with the approved plan (because the rear dormer is flush with the side gable). Under the present planning application, the side view would be greatly improved by reinstating the side hip to the roof.

The proposed side extension would be 5m in width whereas the existing bungalow is 8m wide. Although the proposed extension would not appear subservient in size to the existing pair of bungalows (No's 39 & 41) and would unbalance their widths, it is considered that the provision of the hipped side to the roof would redress the damage that currently exists. It is not considered that it would excessively overbalance the pair, as was the case with the previous application or that it would have an adverse impact on the streetscene.

The rear dormer as existing is dominant because it abuts the side gable, not having been built in accordance with the approved plan. The proposed extension of the dormer as now proposed, although wide, would be set back far enough from the east side of the roof to be acceptable and rectify this problem.

The proposed front dormer would match the existing front dormer and would not adversely affect the character of the street or that of the existing property.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

1PPii (The proposed development would not detract from the existing local urban environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and without detraction from highway safety. It would consequently not conflict with the policies of the Adur District Plan (AG1, AH7) and the West Sussex Structure Plan (DEV1, DEV4-5)

Subject to:-

1. C1Ci
2. C12Ei
3. C18Eiv .. east side walls or roof slope of...

Planning Services Manager..... Date..4/7/08

Development Control Committee Chairman..A. J. Mills.... Date..4/07/08