Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0348/20 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 2 Cypress Close, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Retrospective amendments to approved application AWDM/1454/19: garage and door in north elevation to remain, amendment to south west entrance, addition of roof lights to single storey rear/side extension, addition of false pitched roof to dormer windows, ground floor window on east side elevation to be clear glazed, construction of dormer on west roofslopes with clear glass and openable windows and amendment of previously approved dormer on east roofslope to provide openable windows.

Date of site visit: 22.07.19 for original application and 23.03.20.

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site was originally a gabled roof bungalow with detached garage within a cul de sac of similar dwellings in Shoreham. The site is tucked within the north western corner of the cul de sac with a narrow access. The bungalow is visible within the street scene.

Previously, in August 2019 an application was submitted to remodel the bungalow into a two storey dwelling house which included the raising of the ridge, a two storey extension with Juliette balcony and dormers. (AWDM/1048/19) The scale and impact of such a large and bulky development within the context of this location and proximity to neighbouring dwellings was considered unfavourably by officers and despite some amendments being submitted and discussions with the agent it was advised that this form of development could not be supported and that works which involved the existing ridge height should be considered here instead.

The applicant's agent considered options which involved permitted development and submitted both a Lawful Development Certificate application (AWDM/1605/19) which was permitted and a full planning application AWDM/1454/19 which was also permitted for single storey rear/side (West and North) extension, side facing dormer (West) with 2no. rooflights and South facing first floor window. The plans submitted with the full planning application identified the works which were to be completed under permitted development. These included the east side dormer and one of the west side dormers. These were the subject of the Lawful Development Certificate application. The remainder of the works shown on the approved plans, the additional west side dormer and rear and side single storey extensions, were subject to the approved planning consent.

Following consent being granted work commenced on site which was not in accordance with the approved plans and an application was invited to retrospectively consider the works.

The current application is for retrospective consent for the changes from the previous consent. The final amendment is for consideration here which includes the addition of pitched roofs to the proposed dormers, the east facing dormers obscurely glazed, the west facing dormers clearly glazed and the removal of the first floor rear facing window and the retention of the garage and addition of dummy pitch roof. The dormers which were previously approved under permitted development are now considered as part of this retrospective application on the west elevation as both are shown on the submitted plans to be clearly glazed.

Representations

8 Objections have been received from local residential: -

- Objection received from owner/occupier of 9 Downside Close. Loss of amenity, privacy light and noise, window on north has appeared on plan, close to neighbouring properties and if opening and non obscured will impact on privacy.
- Objection received from owner/occupier of 13 Cypress Close. Design, privacy light and noise, the clear glazing overlooking neighbours should be obscured. I expect permission to be refused.
- Objection received from owner/occupier of 10 Downside Close. Window on north elevation appeared, overlooking, dormer on east side should be obscured.
- Objection received from owner/occupier 12 Downside Close. Additional window on north not necessary, overlooking to neighbouring properties.
- Objection received from owner/occupier 11 Downside Close. Object to window on north side, overlooking should be obscured.
- Objection received from owner/occupier 2 Cypress Close. Object to loss of general amenity, privacy light and noise. Previous consent stated that all windows on east elevation be obscured, this should not be changed. One is installed with clear glazing. The new north facing window overlooks the rear garden and should also be obscured.
- Objection received from owner/occupier of 26 Ravensbourne Avenue. Over development, privacy, light and noise, Trees and landscaping, terrace over pool is raised giving rise to over looking garden noise, overlooking by dormers, object to expansion of land which was a bungalow.
- Objection received from owner/occupier of 24 Ravensbourne Avenue. Light pollution due to roof lights, overlooking from clear glazed windows, increased noise as main activity focused on west side of the building. Loss of trees and pool noisy. Overwhelmed by many amendments.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

The main changes to the visual appearance of the development include the pitched roofs to the dormers and the retention of the garage with additional dummy pitch to the front. The roofs to the dormers increase the scale of the development and although the flat roof design was preferable this addition is not considered to be significantly harmful, it can therefore be supported. The retention of the garage in terms of visual amenity is also of no significant concern and the pitch to the front is in keeping.

As previously was the case the ridge of the bungalow remains as it was originally. Therefore this does allow the form and height of the building to relate to the adjacent bungalows to the east which have a general uniform pattern with the gabled roofs. As was previously considered the position of the bungalow within the plot gives scope for some increase in footprint without over development as spacing still remains to the boundaries, therefore the works as permitted previously and as built are considered acceptable. The dormers are clearly visible within the street scene although they are enlarged from that permitted previously, on balance, it is not considered that the impact is such to justify a refusal in this case in terms of overdevelopment or visual amenity.

Residential amenity

The previous proposal was considered to be acceptable in terms of residential amenity. The current scheme shows changes and such changes must be considered in terms of their impact.

No. 3 Cypress Close to the east of the site is directly adjacent to the development. Currently one of the dormer windows on the eastern elevation is clearly glazed (shown on the plans as obscurely glazed.) The applicant and agent have confirmed that this will be replaced with obscured glazing in time (we are currently in lockdown during Covid-19 outbreak) when they will be able to get the required glazing. In the meantime obscure film is to be used inside the existing clearly glazed window to protect amenity in the short term. A condition is attached to ensure that these windows are to remain obscurely glazed. They are also conditioned to be openable at high level only. If the window is not replaced in a reasonable timeframe taking into account the current situation then the applicant has been advised that enforcement action will be taken.

There is one ground floor window which faces the boundary fence which is to be clearly glazed. This relationship is considered acceptable and there is no significant

impact. The most recent amended plan which is for consideration here shows the first floor rear facing window removed. Therefore there is no overlooking to the rear of no. 3 and the dwellings to the rear in Downside Close. The garage is to be retained and the dummy pitch roof will be adjacent to the boundary to east it will be slightly higher than the flat roof and will have no significant adverse impact. The bungalows to the rear are at a slightly higher ground level and the retention of the garage will not have any consequence.

The dormers to the west side are no longer obscurely glazed as was presented in the previous consents. They are clearly glazed and the dwellings to the west nos. 24 and 26 Ravensbourne Avenue are impacted here. Objections have been received from these dwellings as the dormers face toward their rear gardens and elevations. However in this case the distance between the rear of the neighbouring properties (which themselves have dormers facing the site) and the clearly glazed dormer windows is approximately 24 metres; therefore in terms of Development Management Standards this level of overlooking does not warrant a refusal in this case despite the previous consent showing these dormers to be obscurely glazed. There have been objections due to raised levels to the side of the site however the applicant has confirmed that level change is not in excess of 0.3 metres and therefore not subject to planning consent. Similarly any loss of vegetation at the application site does not require planning consent. Also as previously considered there would be not concern with the use of the side and rear of the bungalow as amenity space and to the creation of internal space that opens onto this external space. This is a residential area and domestic residential activity occurring in relation to any future household would not be significantly detrimental in this case therefore it would not warrant a refusal here.

The works have been carried out without planning consent and deviating from the original consent (s). This is regrettable, however this retrospective application is considered on its planning merits taking into consideration impact and representations made in terms of planning policy and guidance. It is considered that the works as shown on the submitted drawings can be supported here and there would be no justification to warrant a refusal in this case.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Materials to match existing
3. East elevation dormers obscurely glazed and non opening except for 1.7 metres above finished floor level.
4. The windows on the ground floor eastern elevation plans hereby permitted labelled ‘obscured glass’ shall be obscurely glazed at all times and non openable except for above 1.7 metres above finished floor level.
5. No windows on the north elevation at first floor.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? Y

1. Proactive with amendments

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 1st May 2020

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 4 May 2020