Expires
31-03-08

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0073/08 **Recommendation - Permit**

Site: **78 Parkside Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 6HA**

Proposal: **Ground and first-floor rear/north side extension**

The Application

The application is a detached hipped roof house located on rising ground on the east side of Parkside within the built-up area of Shoreham.

The proposal is for a two-storey hipped roof part side part rear extension, 4.5m in width at the rear stepping in to 1.5m wide at the side, by 8.3m in length, by 5.0m in height to eaves level. The proposal would serves as an extension to the kitchen and additional first-floor bedroom with en-suite bathroom.

Parkside is generally characterised by large detached and semi-detached houses with long gardens. To the north is No.80 a large detached house which has been extended to the rear by a two-storey extension across the whole width of the property, and a rear single storey extension (north side). To the south is a detached house which has been extended with a rear conservatory. To the west is No.1 Parkside, a detached bungalow and beyond it Buckingham Park.

A previous planning application (ADC/0654/07) for a similar proposal was withdrawn after an objection from the neighbour to the north was received and negotiation about the design of the scheme was unsuccessful. The applicant feels that the current proposals have now addressed any concerns that the neighbour may have had.

Consultations and Representations

Third parties: There have been no third party objections to the proposals.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (WSCC 2005): LOC1, DEV1, DEV4-5.
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7, and Appendix II ' 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 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 two-storey side extensions should retain a gap to the boundary of at least 1.0m, be set back from the front of the building and have a roof in keeping with the existing dwelling. Rear extensions should allow the retention of garden area of at least 11 metres in depth.

Visual amenity

Visually the proposals would be well set back from the front of the existing property and would therefore ensure a subservient appearance which would not overdominate the dwelling. A gap of 1.2m is retained between the flank wall of the proposals and the boundary with No.80 to the north. It is considered that this gap and the 5.2m set back would prevent the extension from feeling cramped. The hipped roof is sympathetic to the original dwelling and it would not be out of character of incongruous.

Although the proposed extension is long at 8.2m it would only project by 5.0m from the existing rear elevation. Given the size of the plot and the context of the other large dwellings in the vicinity it is felt this would not be too dominant or overbearing on the host dwelling.

Residential amenity

The main concern is the effect the proposed extension would have on the neighbour to the north (No.80).

No.80 is a large detached property which was originally similar in design to the application house. It has been extended twice previously, most notably with a two-storey rear extension (SU/49/88) the entire width of the rear, and prior to this by a long single-storey, ridged roof, rear (north side) extension (SU/103/80) which still protrudes from the rear of the two-storey element. The extensions when built resulted in a very dark internalised dining area in the middle of the house which has no direct outlook or windows. Also the permission for the two-storey extension had a door and window arrangement in the south side elevation of the existing part of the building rather than in the extension. This window and door have been built into the extended part of the house, serving as a second outlook (to the south) for the kitchen rather than how it was approved. No enforcement action was taken at the time.

The two properties are on different ground levels due to the gradient of Parkside, with No.80 being approximately 0.6m higher. The sites are separated by a 2.0m high wall.

The proposed two-storey extension would project beyond the rear (two-storey section) of No.80 by 1.8m and given that the kitchen at No.80 is served by a second window (approved under SU/49/88) which acts as the main outlook toward the east and the rear garden, it is felt that the proposals are sufficiently removed from the boundary to prevent it from feeling overbearing or from having an adverse effect on the outlook from the kitchen of No.80.

The internalised dining area of No.80 is as a result of its own extensions dark and without natural daylight and the proposed extensions to No.78 would not affect this area. The kitchen would still receive adequate daylight from the east facing window.

An obscured glazing condition would prevent overlooking of the property to the south. A garden length of 32m is retained and will prevent any loss of amenity to properties in Greenways Crescent to the east.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPii

1. C1Ci
2. C14Ai – 07.03.08 AH2 of the ADLP and DEV1 of the WSSP
3. C12Ei
4. C18Cii – south
5. C18Eii – north and south

Case Officer: [signature]
Date: 28/3/08

P Barratt 31/3/08