Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/1303/15**

Recommendation – Approve

Site: 118 Greenways Crescent

Proposal: Removal of existing roof and dormers. Erection of new first-floor accommodation, single-storey rear extension and pitched roof over existing garage (Amended re-submission of AWDM/0648/15)

Date of site visit: 25-09-2015

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site relates to a detached bungalow with upper floor accommodation in the form of dormer windows. It is located in an outer residential suburb of Shoreham-by-sea.

The proposal is for a first floor roof extension involving the raising of the roof ridge by more than 2m and eaves to provide for first floor accommodation with its principal windows sitting within the eaves, together with a single storey rear extension with a veranda, plus a pitched roof over the existing integral side garage (the full details are shown on the submitted drawings).

This application is a resubmission of an earlier withdrawn application (AWDM/0648/15 refers), which included a first floor extension at the side, facing onto 120 Greenways Crescent. This side extension was considered bulky, giving rise to consequential visual harm and un-neighbourly impact onto the occupiers of No. 120.

In the current application, the first floor side extension has been omitted. The ridge height increase is unchanged.

Relevant site history
AWDM/0648/15
Replace existing roof and dormers with new first floor to form two-storey dwelling, including replacement single-storey extension to south-west elevation and two-storey extension to south-east elevation to replace existing garage.
Withdrawn 25.06.2015

Consultations
None

Representations

None

Relevant Planning Policies
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
Saved Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Residential amenity

It is the neighbours either side who are principally impacted upon by this development (which is sufficiently physically removed from the remainder so as to avoid adverse harm, including by way of unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy).

The previous advice by the planning officer was that only the side extension at first floor was believed to give rise to neighbour harm; with this element omitted, the bulk and mass of the resultant building would not give rise to adverse overbearing and overshadowing – despite the presence of the larger building.

The rationale for this advice was the first floor extension would not protrude beyond the rear walls of the neighbouring buildings to either side, and that even at the narrowest point some 3 metres would be retained between the extension walls and the neighbouring buildings (with this distance widening toward the site frontage on both sides). The absence of principal windows in either side elevation would ensure overlooking would be largely oblique in nature, with unacceptable loss of privacy avoided.

The remaining elements of the scheme (rear extension and side roof) are single storey and sufficiently removed from neighbours to avoid any resultant harm to their amenities.

Visual amenity

The previous advice by the planning officer was that only the side extension at first floor was visually harmful; with this element omitted, the bulk and mass of the resultant building would not be excessive in the context of the building's setting in the street scene, although a much larger and more prominent building would result.

The rationale for this advice was due to the land level change in a north-south direction between 116 and 120 Greenways Crescent, which allows the scale of the resultant large building to sit acceptably between 116 and 120 in terms of roof ridge and eaves height. Although a much more prominent building, it would not be unduly obtrusive for this reason. Having wide principal windows sitting within the eaves helps reduce the perception of height to the building. The single central window sits comfortably in the front elevation, whilst balancing the building's appearance.

The remaining elements of the scheme (rear extension and side roof) are subservient in scale, with form and shape that appropriately references the host dwelling.

All elements would be built of matching exterior materials/finishes. The new chimney adds detail. An additional betterment is the removal of the ungainly existing porch. Tile hanging is now proposed at first floor instead of render which makes the building visually heavier, but the tile finish is not alien to the existing street scene.

Recommendation

This revised planning application has followed the previous planning officer's advice, which committed the Council to a certain position of support. It would be perverse for the Council to now take a decision contrary to this earlier advice when there is sound rationale for it.

Approve

Subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved Plans
3. Exterior materials/finishes to match
4. Notwithstanding "pd" no further windows/openings than approved at first floor in side elevations
5. First floor windows in side elevations to be obscured and top hung

Informative:

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, 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: Matthew Porter Date: 27-10-2015

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 27 October 2015