Expiry Date - 25/07/2014

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0699/14 Recommendation – REFUSE

Site: 7 Hawkins Road Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 6TJ

Proposal: Single storey pitched roof rear extension with raised steps.

Date of site visit: 05.06.2014

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is located on the south side of the road and comprises a detached bungalow. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature and the dwellings either side are also bungalows. No.9 to the west is shaped with a long north to south axis. No 5 to the east has a rear conservatory.

The proposal seeks planning permission for a single storey pitched roofed rear extension to replace a conservatory. The rear extension would be sited on the same footprint as the conservatory it will replace and would measure a maximum of 6.4m in height x 4.5m wide x 6.2m deep. The land falls to the south and the proposal would have rear double doors opening onto a raised deck with steps to enable access to the garden. There will be no west side windows but one east facing window. Four velux are proposed, two for each roof pitch. Materials would match.

Consultations: None.

Representations:

One letter of representation has been received from the neighbouring occupier at 9 Hawkins Road raising concerns regarding the possibility that the drawings are inaccurate and the gutter will encroach across the common boundary.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’ National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Expiry Date - 25/07/2014

Planning Assessment

Principle

There is no objection to the principle to the proposed development which involves an extension to an existing dwelling house improving the dwelling stock of the area.

Visual amenity

The proposed extension would comprise brick elevations under concrete tiled roofing to match the host dwelling and the roof angle and window alignments would correspond to the existing. It would not be visible from any general public vantage point due to its position at the rear of the property and would therefore not cause any impact on the street scene.

Residential amenity

The proposed addition would replace a modestly proportioned conservatory with glazed side elevations and roofing with a much larger addition of solid external material. Whilst the addition would improve privacy to no 9 by removing glazed elevations on the west side, the larger addition together with the proposed roof tying in with the main roof ridge would have a distinct impact on light to the east facing elevation of no. 9. On the facing side of this dwelling there are a glazed kitchen door that lights the north end of the kitchen (although the kitchen has a south facing window); a window (approx. central on east elevation) that is the sole aperture lighting the dining room, one w.c. window, an entrance door which provides the sole source of natural light for the hall and a bathroom window. The scale, bulk and height of the proposed extension would reduce natural light to an unacceptable degree therefore for the purposes of the neighbouring accommodation affected. Furthermore, the mass of the addition would result in unduly enclosed outlook from the apertures affected.

There is a reasonable distance of separation between the proposed addition and the property at no. 5 to the east. The removal of the current garage would also compensate to an extent for any resultant increase in shadowing and loss of outlook for the purposes of the occupants of this neighbouring dwelling. The proposed side window cannot reasonably be considered to present a significant risk to privacy as it would replace a currently much wider expanse of glazing. Account has been taken of the extension projecting 4m deeper back than the main rear elevation of the dwelling to the east but no. 5 has a rear conservatory extension that reduces this difference in depth. In addition, the extension will sit 2m from the common boundary, and would occupy the same rearward position as the conservatory that it would replace.

It is not considered that the rooflights would have any adverse impact on neighbour privacy being an acceptable height above floor level so obscure glazing would not be necessary. The new south window would face no neighbouring property at close quarters and the new side window would light a bathroom so could be conditioned to be obscure glazed.

By reason of the impact on light and outlook to no. 9 however, it is considered that the proposed extension would conflict with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance, Extensions & Alterations to Dwellings, in respect of the effect upon neighbour living conditions.

The proposed deck and steps would not be so large as to run the risk of unneighbourly usage beyond that currently possible.

With regard to the points raised in the representation, it is acknowledged that there is some discrepancy between the block plan and other drawings in terms of the position of the dwelling and proposed extension. It is considered however that the plans are sufficiently detailed overall to enable objective assessment. The applicant's agent has provided replacement drawings to clarify that eaves will not encroach.

Recommendation

REFUSE

Reason:

The proposed extension, by reason of its position, height and bulk would lead to poor outlook and unacceptable loss of natural light for the purposes of the neighbouring property at no. 9 Hawkins Road and would thereby conflict with Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7.} the Councils Supplementary Planning Guidance, 'Extensions & Alterations to Dwellings' and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

Case Officer: L Simmons Date: 3 July 2014

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 3.7.2014

Expiry Date - 25/07/2014