expires 27.08

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0346/08 **Recommendation - Refuse**

Site: **4 Orchard Close Southwick Brighton West Sussex**

Proposal: **Loft conversion (with half-hipped side gable and front and rear dormers) and two-storey rear extension**

The Application

The application relates to the southern half of a pair of semi-detached houses located on the west side of Orchard Close, within the built up area of Southwick. The house is a hipped roof pebble dashed building in a close of similar designed houses, the majority of which are ex-Council owned dwellings.

The proposal is to extend the living accommodation with a roof extension including a front dormer which would be 2.1m wide by 1.5m in height, and a rear dormer which would be 3.2m wide by 1.9m in height. The roof extension would provide additional space for a fourth bedroom and shower room. The proposal also includes a two-storey extension on the southern part of the rear elevation, to provide additional ground floor living space and an enlarged second bedroom. It would be 3.3m in width, by 2.9m in depth, by 6.3m to the ridge of the hipped roof.

The close is made up of similar style dwellings all of which have hipped roofs. There are no front dormers within the close and no rear dormers on any of the properties located on the west side. The attached property (No.2) has been extended with a rear conservatory which shares a party wall with the conservatory at the application site and a kitchen extension at the rear. To the south is a similar pair of semi-detached houses (No's 6&8). No.6 has a large rear extension with a dummy pitched roof. To the west is located 72-96 Manor Hall Road, a Council Owned terrace of single-storey bungalows. No.86 is located directly to the west of the application house.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: There has been one letter of objection from the attached dwelling, No.2 Orchard Close. The owner objects to the front and rear dormers as no other houses in the close have them. They feel that it will alter the roof line and character of the close. They also object to loss of privacy and light, and feel that the objections can be overcome by fitting velux windows.

They also raise concerns that the value of their property has been reduced. ***[NB: Not a material consideration to be considered]***

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005) (saved policies): LOC1, DEV1
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.'
PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies
Structure Plan policies seek to protect and, where possible enhance the character and distinctiveness of areas, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). Policy AH7 of the Local Plan, relation specifically to extensions and alterations to dwellings, states that they should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable loss of light or privacy or have an overbearing effect on the neighbouring dwelling and be sympathetic to the original dwelling. Supplementary Planning Guidance in DC Standard No. 3 'Extension and Alteration to Dwellings' states that two-storey extensions on semi-detached or terraced properties that are within 1 metre of a side boundary with an attached dwelling should normally be no deeper than 2 metres. A rear extension should also allow the retention of garden area of at least 11 metres in depth. Two-storey extensions should also have a pitched roof to match the existing house.

Visual amenity
There are currently no front dormers or part-gable/ full gable roof extensions within the Orchard Close itself. The applicant has provided evidence of front dormers and roof extensions within the vicinity but it is felt that the character of the Close is made up by the houses within it rather than any surrounding bungalows, and on this basis it is considered that the proposals would unbalance the pair of semi-detached houses and would be out of character, and as a result would be detrimental to the amenity of the streetscene.

The rear roof slope is clearly visible from Manor Hall Road to the north with the neighbouring unaltered roofs beyond to the south, and due to the lack of any other form of roof extensions it is felt that in principle the rear dormer would be unacceptable due to the excessive size and proximity to the ridge line and boundary and would create a feature out of scale with the original dwelling.

The proposed two-storey extension is not considered to be particularly overbearing or overdominant given that it would have a matching roof form and would only project by 2.9m, the same distance as the existing conservatory. It height would mean that it would be less visible that the

proposed dormer, and viewed within the context of the rear of the houses rather than in the roof slope. Its scale would not appear cramped and it is considered to be visually acceptable.

Residential amenity – loss of privacy

The bungalow directly to the west is one of a terrace of small scale Council dwellings. They are arranged in a way that results in there being little private outdoor space. The front shared green space is overlooked by Manor Hall Road, and the rear garden areas, which are 9.0m in length, have a communal pathway that runs through them. The main grassed garden areas on the east side of No's 86 & 88 are not separated by fences or planting and are open plan. The garden areas to the south of No.86 are more defined and separate.

The proposed two-storey extension would enlarge an existing bedroom and although the west side window would be closer to the bungalow to the rear the slightly angled views would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy. The two-storey extension would not have windows in the north or south elevation, and would not impact on the privacy of the adjacent neighbours in Orchard Close (No's 2 & 6).

The proposed rear dormer would be 21.5m from the rear of No.86 Manor Hall Road, whilst this is slightly below the 22m as set out in the above Development Control Standard it is considered that as the rooms at the rear appear to be a kitchen and back door with small windows, on balance, the loss of privacy would not be so unacceptable as to warrant refusal on that basis.

The proposed rear dormer would have angled views towards the rear of the gardens of the adjacent dwellings but these would not result in loss of privacy to an unacceptable level.

Residential amenity – loss of light, overshadowing

The two-storey extension would be directly south of the attached house. There would be a 3.6m separation gap between it and the boundary which would prevent there being any excessive overshadowing. There would be no loss of direct sunlight into the rear west facing rooms of the dwelling.

Recommendation

REFUSE on ground that :-

1. B5CR – amended
   The proposed roof extension would be out of keeping...etc

Case Officer:
Date: 28/07/08

PB 25/7