EXPIRES 13/12/07.

Application No.: ADC/0644/07 **Recommendation – Permit Application**

Site: **4 Lodge Court, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex**

Proposal: **Two-Storey Rear Extension & Single Storey Side Extension to Rear of Garage**

The Application

The application site contains a detached double storey dwelling with brick walls and a clay tile side gable ended roof, located at the southern end of a cul-de-sac within the built up area of Shoreham. The dwelling appears to have been modified several times since its erection in the 1960's. The latest proposal involves erection of:

- A single storey side extension measuring 3.8m deep by 2.8m wide, with a roof that slopes down from the existing garage towards the rear of the property. The extension is intended to be used as a utility room and matches the dimensions of an extension approved in March 1998 (SU/25/98/TP) but was never erected;
- A double storey rear extension measuring 3.3m deep by 8.5m wide, involving an extension of the hip ended rear roof line. The added floor space will be used as additional living space on the ground floor and facilitate the creation of an additional two bedrooms (total of 5) and one ensuite (total of 3) at the first floor level;
- Installation of a new window in the first floor north-eastern side elevation, as a light source into a newly created bedroom. In order to allow for a clear and fully openable window (meeting minimum amenity and fire safety standards), a special box is proposed to be attached onto the side of the wall which changes the orientation of the window from the side to the rear.

Lodge Court consists of 6-8 large detached dwellings each utilising similar building materials, but of varying configuration on large sized plots.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: One representation has been received from the owners of adjoining No.3 Lodge Court. Initially they raised concerns with a loss of outlook and daylight due to the height and length of the rear extension, and a loss of privacy as a result of the new first floor window on the northern side elevation (which would look directly into their ground floor living area). Upon reviewing the amended designs the neighbour's are now satisfied that the plans address their earlier concerns.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plans 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005):

LOC1, DEV1

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996):

AG1, AH7 & Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No. 3 'Extensions & 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.

Council's Development Control Standard No.3 recommends that principal windows of rear extensions be setback a minimum of 22m from principal windows on dwellings to the rear. For side extensions it recommends that they be set back a minimum of 1m from the side boundary. If an area is spacious in layout and the buildings are large, a space greater than 1m may well be necessary to avoid an appearance of overdevelopment and a cramped effect.

Visual Amenity, Character & Appearance

Located to the rear of the existing dwelling, the alterations (including the window box) are largely shielded from public view. Notwithstanding the above, the proposed form of extensions match the existing building and are considered complimentary to both the style of the building and character of the surrounding locality. The intended use of matching building materials assists in this regard.

Residential Amenity – Daylighting

As a result of the two storey portion of the extension being set well back from plot boundaries (and in particular the side boundary of No.3 Lodge Court), and the amended design utilising a hipped end roof profile, the proposal is not expected to have any adverse impact on the adjoining dwelling's access to daylight. For the same reason it is not expected to be overbearing in its relationship to adjoining properties.

Residential Amenity – Privacy

Despite the unique arrangement of the plot meaning that the rear extension will come within close proximity to the rear boundary of the plot, the first floor windows are located in excess of the 22m distance recommended in DCS No.3 from principal windows of habitable rooms on dwellings to the rear. Whilst some overlooking of adjacent gardens is inevitable therefore (a situation made worse by the drop in ground level between the sites and

properties to the rear), it is not considered a significant loss of privacy would occur as to warrant refusal of the application on this ground.

With respect to the new window in the north-eastern elevation, the proposed window box is an innovative design solution which not only protects the privacy of No.3's ground floor living area, but assures some level of amenity is provided to the room's inhabitant, whilst also meeting subsequent building standards relating to emergency escape. In a more prominent position such a feature may not be desirable, however in this instance it is considered acceptable as the box is well hidden from public view due to the pitch of the roof above the existing integral garage.

Access & Parking

The proposal involves no alteration to the access and parking arrangement that exists on-site.

Amenity Space

Despite the addition, the property maintains a large side garden that is screened for exclusive private use, well in excess of the amenity space requirements outlined in Council's development standards.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:- 1PPi

Subject to:-

1. C1Ci
2. C14Ai (Amended Plan - 10th December 2007)

   Reason: *For the avoidance of doubt.*
3. C12Ei

Case Officer: ..... Date: 12/12/07