Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0894/14 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 27 Hawkins Road Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex

Proposal: Two-storey rear extension

Date of site visit: 2.9.14

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is a semi-detached dwellinghouse built with its upper floor accommodation within the roof slope.

The proposal is for a two-storey rear extension to measure (at max) 6.5 metres in height, 4m deep with a 6.5 metre long ridge, and 7.8 metres in width.

The surrounding area is an outer suburb of Shoreham, residential in its character.

Relevant site history
None

Consultations
None

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies
National Planning Policy Framework
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'

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Visual amenity

The extension is overly large and despite its ridge being lower than that of the main roof, its scale would compete with that of the host dwelling. When

viewed from the rear and sides, the original form of the bungalow is largely lost.

Harm to the character and appearance of the bungalow's original architectural form and shape would not be respected, and the resultant bulk and mass would be excessive.

Residential amenity

The neighbours principally impacted upon by this development are those either side and at the rear of the application site (it is physically removed from the remainder).

Neighbours to rear

With over 20 metres retained between the extension and the neighbouring buildings to the rear, no adverse harm would arise from overbearing and overshadowing.

Although the proposal would introduce a first floor window, the distance involved would negate the potential for intrusive overlooking into the habitable rooms of the neighbours to the rear.

Neighbour to north-east (no 25 Hawkins Road)

The extension would be an imposing flank to this neighbouring building, which would have some impact onto this neighbour.

However there would be at least 2.5 metres between the extension and the neighbouring building. Additionally, No 25 sits above No 27 due to a change in land level. All this reduces the impacts of overbearing and overshadowing, so that their severity would not be adverse.

The first floor rear window would allow for oblique overlooking. The roof light in the side would not allow for direct overlooking and the absence of widows/openings in the flank means unacceptable loss of privacy would be avoided.

Attached neighbour to south-west (no. 23 Hawkins Road)

The first floor rear window would allow for oblique overlooking. The roof light in the side would not allow for direct overlooking and the absence of widows/openings in the flank means unacceptable loss of privacy would be avoided.

The applicant's agent has pointed out that the eaves of the extension would be at the same height as the existing building. However, the extension is at two-storey height and would be built only 100mm off from the shared boundary with this application property. The sheer extent of new roof slope and wall, at a length of 4 metres extending to a height of 6.5 metres, means this extension would represent an imposing solidity that would severely curtail outlook and daylight and sunlight to the neighbour's rear habitable living space. It would result in adverse and unacceptable overshadowing and

overbearing, the severity of which would be detrimentally harmful to that neighbour's residential amenities.

The length of the rear extension would fail to accord with the Council's adopted Development Control Standard No. 3 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" Supplementary Planning Guidance.

This guidance is unambiguous in ruling that *whilst two-storey rear extensions that are within 1m of a side boundary with an attached dwelling should normally be no deeper than 2.0m; extensions abutting the boundary will not normally be permitted (para. 3.2).*

Accordingly, this proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of Adur Saved Local Plan Policy AH7 parts (a) and (e) which requires that extensions do not result in an unacceptable degree of impact on neighbouring dwellings in terms of loss of natural light or overbearing effect.

This saved policy is in conformance with the Core Planning Principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (para. 17), which seek *to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings*.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the reason:-

The proposal, by reason of its excessive scale, bulk, mass and length, and two-storey height, together with its abutment to the shared boundary with the neighbour to the south-west (No 23 Hawkins Road), would harm the character of the original dwelling and result in a severe and unacceptable overbearing and overshadowing effect onto the rear habitable living space of the attached neighbour, to the detrimental of their residential amenities. It would, therefore, fail to conform to the Core Planning Principles of the National Planning Policy Framework in seeking to secure a good standard of amenity for all occupants, locally expressed in Adur Saved Local Plan Policy AH7 and allied adopted SPG Development Control Standard No. 3 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings"

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to resolve those matters within the timescale allocated for the determination of this planning application. However, the Local Planning Authority has clearly set out, within its report, the steps necessary to remedy the harm identified within the reasons for refusal – which may lead to the submission of a more acceptable proposal in the future. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

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

Case Officer: Matthew Porter Date: 2-9-2014

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 2 September 2014