Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0343/20 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 4 Tottington Way, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Proposed front/side extension and proposed rear/side extension (garage removed.)

Date of site visit: 26th November 2019 (for pre application advice)

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a detached bungalow to the north of Downside, Tottington Way. Here there are a row of three bungalows of original matching design, some of which have been extended and altered over time. On the opposite side of the road are two similar style gabled roof bungalows.

Consent is sought to remove an existing detached single garage to the side of the property and build an enlarged side and rear single storey extension. It is shown on the submitted plans to be 8 metres beyond the rear wall of the existing bungalow extending also to the side of the bungalow by 2.3 metres. A half hipped roof is proposed to the rear addition. Also proposed with a half hipped roof is a front extension to the north side of the building. This is an infill to the existing recessed section to the north side, 2.4 metres wide and 5.3 metres in depth. The rear extension is to provide open plan dining/kitchen/living space and a new entrance hall and utility. The front/side extension is to provide a bedroom.

Representations

1 letter of objection received from the owner of no. 6 Tottington Way, which is in use as an HMO

- Loss of light and privacy at 6 Tottington Way.
- Disturbance due to hours of work.
- Proposed windows on side elevation overlooking
- Reducing space between dwellings.
- Loss of light and outlook.

Consultations

Adur and Worthing Council: - **Environmental Health**: -

Work shall be limited to hours of Monday to Friday 08:00 – 18:00
Saturday 09:00 – 13:00 hours
Sundays and bank holidays no work permitted.

No development shall commence until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Contaminated Land condition

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 front extension to the north elevation will be visible within the street scene. It is however considered acceptable, it replicates similar extensions at adjacent dwellings (No. 6 to the north) and with a slight set back and lowered roof levels it is of subservient scale.

The rear/side addition appears large in footprint, however other than the side addition this will not be visible within the street scene, it also includes the demolition of the existing garage. It is similar in scale to the extension to the south permitted under AWDM/1761/18 which has a higher roof than that proposed. It will therefore not be a development which is out of keeping in character in this case. The element which is visible to the side will form the new entrance. It is set down lower than the ridge and narrow in scale in relation to the width of the bungalow. Space will still remain to the side boundary. Materials will all be used to match existing.

Consent was granted at no. 6 to the north for the change of use from a 6bed HMO to a 7 bedroom House of Multiple Occupation, AWDM/1789/16. The approved plans included a rear extension and this has been implemented. Although the extension is not as deep as that proposed here the neighbouring bungalow is set back in the site further so the impact is similar. No. 6 is also at a higher ground level.

Residential amenity

As stated above both bungalows to the north and south have been extended to the rear. The extension to the south has no windows on the north side elevation and the proposed extension also has no south facing windows. There will be no impact therefore upon the amenities of the occupiers to the south.

The property to the north is a House of Multiple Occupation. Therefore consideration must be given to the amenities of all the individual occupiers. Neighbour letters have been sent to each occupier informing them of the proposals as well as the owner of the building. An objection has been received from the owner as set out above.

The main concern here is in relation to the south facing windows at no. 6 which currently face onto the application site. The windows serve an entrance hall, bathroom and bedroom. The proposed extension will be built adjacent to these windows. It is acknowledged that the ground level is lower at the application site and the roof design attempts to limit the height of the extension however there will be loss of light and outlook to these windows. In terms of the weight of this impact the entrance hall window and bathroom windows both serve non habitable rooms and therefore loss of outlook and light to these windows is not of justifiable significance here and this impact would not warrant a refusal. Also, the unusual circumstance where these adjacent windows face directly onto the rear garden of the application site needs to be considered. There is currently no privacy to such windows and the outlook is over the neighbouring private amenity space. The extension would create a boundary and screen between the properties which currently doesn't exist. Despite the loss of light it is considered that the impact to these two non habitable rooms is acceptable.

In terms of the bedroom window which faces south, again this currently overlooks the private amenity space at the application site and mutual overlooking occurs here. On balance the impact here is considered acceptable. Again due to the unusual relationship here, the proposed extension offering some screening and boundary treatment and the use of the existing neighbouring dwelling which gives rise to the existing layout. No 6 is also at a higher level and the proposed roof form is low level. There will be loss of light and loss of outlook here but as set out above, on balance, this would not warrant a refusal in this case. The works to no. 6 gave rise to this current situation where a side window was necessary due to the rear addition blocking off rear aspect. On balance, it is not considered that this situation should remove the option of extending at the application site, despite the impact.

A condition is attached to ensure that the north facing bathroom window is fitted with obscure glazing and is non openable except for high level openers. Also a condition is attached to restrict any openings in the north or south elevations of either of the extensions to protect amenities. It is noted that an additional side window is proposed in the original part of the building to serve bedroom 4. Therefore this work is permitted development and therefore a condition could not be attached to require this window to be obscurely glazed in this case.

The front extension is adjacent to the boundary of no. 6 and will project further forward than the existing building. It is however considered that due to the spacing between the buildings and the scale of the development that this will not result in any loss of light or overbearing impact which would have any adverse impact.

Other Matters

It is noted above that Environmental Health have requested conditions relating to hours of work, Construction Management Plans and Contaminated Land. This is a householder application and such conditions are not generally a requirement for this scale/type of development. However in this case, taking into consideration the use of the adjacent property as an HMO and the proximity of bedrooms to the site of the proposed extension, such a condition is deemed appropriate here. However to be consistent with the developments either side of the site condition requiring a Construction Management Plan has not been included and a Contaminated Land informative has been attached.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials to match existing
4. No additional windows on the north or south elevation of the extensions
5. The window on the north elevation shall be obscurely glazed and non openable except for above 1.7 metres above finished floor level.
6. Hours of work

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

1.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.

2. Contaminated Land

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 8th May 2020

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 11 May 2020