Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0684/16 Recommendation – APPROVE+

Site: 69 Downside, Shoreham-by-Sea, BN43 6HF

Proposal: Ground floor front infill extension, side porch, and remodelling of roof comprising hipped gables to north and south including raised ridge including east and west dormers

Date of site visit: 19.05.2016

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a small detached bungalow located on the south side of Downside. The application site and neighbouring properties are bungalows, but 3 doors down (63) there is a 2 storey residential property. Many of the bungalows within the street have 1st floor extensions with either raised roofs, or dormers or both.

The application site has an existing vehicular access with a drive to the side of the dwelling next to no. 67, and a detached garage to the boundary with no. 67. The property has an existing rear conservatory type extension. The dwelling has a front and side hard surfaced area. The bungalow itself is quite narrow. Its current entrance door is to the side corner, within an open porch.

The topography of the area is such that the land levels vary considerably within the application site as too other sites, e.g. the land is higher on the north side of the road, and lower on land behind the dwelling. The bungalow itself is lower than the hardsurfacing on the property, and the hardsurfacing itself is lower than the pavement. The rear of the application site is lower than the front, there are steps down from the conservatory into the garden, and continues down through the garden, the terracing of the garden terminates at the rear boundary. A large Copper Beech is positioned within the end, lower section of the garden, which forms a visual buffer between the application site and the rear property in Greenways Crescent.

No. 71 has a side dormer which is very close to the application site, and directly overlooks. No. 67 has a rear conservatory and side porch with windows facing to the application site. No. 71 and 73 have rear roof extensions.

Proposal

The application seeks permission to infill the existing set back porch; add a new porch to the east side; raise the ridge of the roof to provide a first floor; and a flat roof dormer to each side of the roof.

There will be a few changes to the existing fenestration on the ground floor with two new windows to the front elevation; a new entrance door and window will replace the bedroom window on the east elevation; and the bricking up of the wc window on the west elevation. It should be noted that the south elevation will see the construction of a "permitted development" extension, AWDM/0668/16 refers, and that that extension is separate to this submission.

The first floor fenestration will include a window at the centre point on the front, north elevation, serving bedroom 2; 2no. rooflights within the east facing roofslope, one will serve bedroom 2 whilst the other will provide light to the new stairway. There will be a further window on the east elevation, serving a new bedroom dormer; a central window within the south elevation will serve bedroom 1; on the west elevation, 2no. new rooflights will serve bedroom 1, and a window will be within the new bathroom dormer; finally there will be 1no. rooflight to serve bedroom 2.

Consultations: None undertaken.

Representations: Letters of Objection from 45, 49, 65, 67, 70, 71, 72, 73, 76 Downside; 3 Broad Reach, Shoreham-by-Sea; 31 New Barn Road, Shoreham-by-Sea;

- The application is misleading amalgamation of applications. We request that drawings are submitted that relate exactly to the specific application to which they pertain.

- The neighbouring properties positions and eaves/ridge positions etc. should be added to the drawings

- Relative levels of the proposals and neighbouring site are not represented accurately in the description of the proposals or the drawing information i.e. there seems to be steps down from the applicant's site to the neighbours which add between 375 and 525 mm to the height of the proposal.

- Request the drawings are dimensioned to confirm the elevations match the plans and confirm the heights of the additional elements

- Request a visit to the neighbouring home to assess the impact as the extensions will impact on living conditions on the way the neighbours kitchen, conservatory and garden are used. The application balcony will lead to a loss of privacy and a sense of undue bearing to the secluded garden

- A light study should be undertaken to show the impact on the neighbours. The proposal will unacceptably impact onto the neighbour. We request a full sun-light shadow cast model be presented to the neighbour to review, and a day-light and sun-light study be presented pertaining to the Building Research Establishment's Sit Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight : A Guide to Good Practice (BRE 1995)

- Design lacks coherence and is unattractive, unbalancing and misses an opportunity to produce something that is of its time.

- The application should be withdrawn to allow time for the applicant to redress the above comments and requests for information.

- The extension at the front, rear and sides would result in a reduction of light to our ground floor extension, which would reduce the privacy of the garden and rooms at the rear of 71 Downside

- Neighbours would like to discuss technical concerns on site of the full impact to their properties

- Concerned that the revised plans effectively more than doubles the size of the existing building.

- The increased height will reduce the amount of available light

- Not in keeping with other homes nearby

- Extensions to bungalows that have taken place have been done in such a way as to minimise the impact to neighbours and maintain the general character of the road

- Does not accord with the NPPF, Part 7, Sections 58 and 66; or WSCC SP, G5; and Adur LP, AH7

- Likely have Asbestos within the house which will need to be safely removed.

- Overdevelopment and out of character with Downside

- Loss of views

- Invasion of privacy

- If the Council allow this development it will show a complete disregard for the residents who elected them

- Severe loss to client who is a practicing naturist

- Precedent for future overdevelopment in beautiful area of Sussex

- Have been a neighbour of no. 67 until recently, so I can understand that the proposed extension will be enormously invasive obstructing light and evening sun from her property and onto no. 71

- unfair on all neighbours concerned

- The porch will cut off vehicular access to the garage and reduce off road parking

- Concerned for no. 67
- We live opposite and the proposal will cause loss of privacy to our property, and would cause parking problems as more vehicles would be at the property
- Decrease value of neighbouring homes
- Grey tile roof is out of keeping
- Most of surrounding properties are traditional brick and tile construction or chalet bungalows
- Previous letters have not been responded to
- Object to front and rearward extensions and the removal of the existing roof and replacement with a second story and new roof
- The first floor extension to the north elevation will overhang the ground floor and be unsightly, there is no precedent for this style of extension in the surrounding area
- The plans are misleading as the representation of the other 3 neighbouring properties are not to scale
- Development is so close to 71 and would be overbearing and oppressive.
- Obscure glazing would not stop the effect of overlooking
- Ridge height of 65 is 2.75m above the guttering and not 4.0m inferred on the north elevation drawings
- Adur and Worthing must double check all such details
- Reduction in the potential off road parking due to the proposed porch cutting off access to the garage and large part of the drive

1 Letter of Support from 78 Downside

- Property is directly opposite me and I am shocked at the objections.
- It would certainly not ‘overlook’ or block light for the houses next door
- It has been sympathetically designed and is nowhere near as big as they could go if wanted
- All the houses on Downside are all different shapes and sizes, single and two storey
- I cannot fathom how the proposed works could be deemed ‘out of character’ for the street
- To say a precedent would be set is 15 years too late
- Ironically, some of the houses that have objected have been improved and made larger
- Home improvements are good for the road and pulls up the valuations

- This house is in desperate need of work and improvement
- Fully support the proposal

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/0668/16 Householder application for permitted development for prior approval for single storey extension to rear of property measuring 5.61m from rear wall of the original house, maximum height 3.99m and height of eaves of the extension 2.99m Prior Approval Not Required Issued: 14.06.2016

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No. 3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extension which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the neighbouring properties

Following revisions, the proposed extension would see the raising of the height of the roof above the highest point of the existing roof by a maximum of 1 metre, the new roofline, will be level from front to back, providing a uniform appearance. The new roof will travel from the existing overhang at the front of the dwelling, through to the existing back point of the dwelling. The new roof containing a first floor, will not continue over the rear, single storey element that was deemed permitted development on an earlier application (AWDM/0668/16 refers). From the sides (east and west), the roof increase will slope away from both neighbouring properties, no.'s 71 and 67, thereby minimizing its impact onto those properties.

No. 71 has a similar roof shape to that proposed, and it too has had flat roof side dormers set into its side elevations. Indeed, the dormer on its east side, not only is quite large, it is also has a large, clear glazed window set into it that directly looks over the application site. The base of the dormer to no. 71 sits slightly forward of the outside wall, and the dormer roof is very close to the ridge tiles. Conversely, the dormers on the application site will be set back from the outside wall and will be considerably lower than the ridge height of the proposal, thereby not overpowering the roof elevations.

The dormer in the west elevation, will be serving a bathroom, and will be facing the roof of the neighbouring property no. 71. By reason of it serving a bathroom, there will be a condition on any approval, requiring the window to be obscure glazed. The new bathroom will be in approximately the same position as the existing ground floor bathroom and w.c., only of course higher, and thereby the windows will be in a similar position to the existing bathroom

and w.c. Its position, will be to the north of the dormer at no. 71, thereby not resulting in unacceptable overlooking onto that window.

The existing dormer of no. 71 will partially look out onto the rear section of the increased roof height of no. 69. The view that no. 71currently has is onto the existing roof of no. 69 and over the rear garden areas of neighbouring properties, and mainly roofs of the properties on the other side of the road in Downside, that of course will partially alter following the proposed development. However, the opening casement and fanlight window will likely be maintaining a view from it other than that of the roof. Though, it should be noted that the existing roof hip could have been extended to become a gable roof, as per the application, under permitted development. Further, it is enshrined within planning legislation that no one has a right to a view. As the new roof will be sloping away from the dormer at no. 71, it is considered that there will be adequate daylight entering the room it serves, namely a bedroom.

With regard to the ground floor of the proposed west elevation of no. 69, there will be one less window than currently exists.

Turning now to no. 67, there are changes that will be taking place on the east elevation of no. 69, that may be of note to no. 67. Firstly, there will be the provision of an entrance porch, which will replace the existing bedroom window. The porch would be positioned slightly south of the entrance porch to no. 67, but unlike no. 67, the new porch will be set approx. 800mm off the boundary, thus allowing continued pedestrian access to the rear garden of the application site. This entrance porch will be close to the neighbouring one, but this is considered not an unreasonable situation for properties that are sited so close to one another.

The existing conservatory window will also be removed by the proposal, and no replacement window is proposed. This window, did look towards the existing conservatory of no. 67. There will be no other windows put into the east elevation of the proposal, thereby maintaining the status quo.

The first floor of the proposed east elevation will provide 2no. rooflights, one serving as a light source to the new staircase and the other serving bedroom 2. Neither of these rooflights are considered to result in overlooking to no. 67.

There will be the provision of a flat roof dormer to the east roofslope, which will help provide bedroom 3, and there will be a window facing towards no. 67, however, this window will be glazed with obscure glass to prevent overlooking of no. 67, and the opening fanlight will be higher than 1.7m from the floor level of the new room, thus no demonstrable overlooking onto the neighbouring property will occur. The dormer will have an additional window on its south, which will be clear glass, but because it is not directly facing the neighbouring property, it too will not result in unacceptable overlooking onto the neighbour.

The final part of the development on the east elevation, would be the raising of the roof line. No. 67 does not have any first floor windows or dormers facing the application site, but they do have windows on their west elevation facing the application. Other than the entrance porch which is discussed earlier, there is a kitchen; another is a bathroom; and another is a toilet

window. Lastly there is the side section of the glazed conservatory. The kitchen, bathroom and wc are not habitable rooms and thereby they are not a material consideration with regard to daylight. The conservatory is positioned to the rear of the property, and it will be beyond the roof extension of the application site, thereby it will not be affected by the proposal.

Finally, the point raised by representations that the garage will become inaccessible following the construction of the new entrance porch. It should be noted that the provision of a garage is not a necessary requirement of the property, and in any case, the 'drive' leading to the garage is only 2metres wide, which would prevent most vehicles traversing it in the first instance and of those that could, it would be a very tight space.

The plans as amended, have taken great care so as to not result in unacceptable harm onto either of its direct neighbours, they have limited the amount of new windows on each of the side elevations i.e. there will be 3no. rooflights on the west roofslope which will be secondary windows to the rooms they are serving and will be positioned 1.7m above finished floor levels of the rooms they are serving. There will also be a window within the new dormer serving a bathroom, and this window will be glazed with obscure glass.

A similar situation regarding windows exists on the east elevation with the removal of a bedroom window, and its replacement with the new entrance porch. First floor rooflights will be positioned 1.7m above finished floor levels and the former window will be obscure glazed.

The roof height will change, but for reasons given above, it is not considered that the additional height will be so demonstrable as to justify the withholding of a planning approval.

It is considered that the design of the dwelling will be improved along and will provide uplift to the site. These improvements are considered to not result in unacceptable harm to neighbouring residential properties, or the overall character and appearance of the street scene.

Recommendation

APPROVE Subject to conditions

1. Approved plans
2. Standard time limit
3. East wind. in east dormer shall be obscure glazed & fixed non-opening
4. Windows of bathrooms and shower room to be obscure glass
5. All rooflights to be 1.7m above FFL
6. Materials to match existing
7. No additional side windows

Informative

1. Approved following revisions
2. Precautionary asbestos

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 18.08.2016

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 18.08.2016