Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1104/22 Recommendation: APPROVE

Site: 29 Meadowview Road, Sompting, West Sussex

Proposal: Single storey rear extension with raised steps

Date of Site Visit: visited when considering annex application, photos provided with application.

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional neighbour notification: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings:

The application site is a semi detached bungalow, consent was recently granted under AWDM/0373/22 for an annex building adjacent to the rear boundary. The current application seeks consent for a single storey hipped roof rear extension. The extension is 3 metres in depth and the full width of the bungalow. External steps are proposed to the rear leading to the garden. Consent is only required here due to the steps being greater than 0.3 metres from the ground level. The dimension of the extension would not normally exceed the limits for permitted development.

Representations

2 letters of representation received from the owner/occupier of no. 31 Meadowview Road and 36 Hillside Road making the following comments/objections: -

- The plans show the extension overlapping our property and encroachment.
- Removal of fence and sky dish on neighbouring property neighbour disputes and boundary issues.
- The garden at no 29 is lower than no 31 overlooking due to the raised steps.
- The garden annex recently approved overlooks the property.
- Limited garden area will remain after the annex and extension are built.
- Impact on privacy, right to light and air.
- Trees and high fencing proposed along boundary affected light and out look.
- Limited access gap to side of property should elderly relative become ill.
- Parking in the area has become congested and applicant parking on a neighbours drive.
- Reference is also made to a legal covenant which would remove the rights to implement the annex consent.

- Once the annex is not required any more it will remain an addition that can be capitalised upon.
- The bungalow exceeds the 50% entitlement.
- Encroach on the neighbours privacy and light the steps will allow the neighbour to be overseen by the neighbours.
- On going legal dispute regarding the boundary wall.

1 representation received from the owner/occupier of 17 Nelson Close. No objection - Having seen the plans I do not believe it to either affect my privacy or cause any adverse effect to myself or my property.

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 (July 2021)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

Planning Assessment

Principle

The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Visual amenity

The extension is small in scale at 3 metres in depth therefore subservient to the main dwelling. The roof design and use of materials are in keeping with the existing bungalow. The rear steps provide access to the garden and are not out of keeping as a feature.

Residential amenity

The main properties to be affected are those either side. The attached bungalow has a flat roof rear extension slightly deeper than that proposed here. There will be no significant adverse impact in terms of overlooking, loss of light or overbearing impact. The steps are set in from the boundary and provide no space for seating or prolonged use, they are purely a means of access to the garden at lower ground level. No significant loss of privacy will occur as a result despite the raised level adjacent to the neighbouring property.

The neighbour has expressed concern with regards to overlooking, loss of light and overbearing impact. In terms of the proposed extension it does not extend beyond

the rear of the neighbouring extension. The steps are elevated however as stated above these are a means of access to the garden. Currently the rear of both bungalows is elevated and the boundary fence appears relatively low. To provide more privacy to both properties the neighbours could mutually choose to raise the fence height which would offer more screening. The neighbouring extension has rear windows which face toward the rear of the application site and the same will be the case with the proposed extension and the neighbouring garden. This is acceptable and not unusual within residential areas such as this and as mentioned the fence could offer more screening at an increased height if necessary. There would be no justification to refuse this application on the grounds of overlooking.

In terms of the concerns over encroachment, the drawings submitted have been superseded with revised plans which show a set in and therefore do encroach over the boundary. Agreements between the neighbours as to how the construction will take place in relation to the boundary are civil and building control matters. Many of the other matters outlined in the objection are civil matters between the applicant and the adjacent occupiers to resolve privately. They do not justify a refusal of this modest extension.

There are side windows to the neighbouring property to the other side which face onto the site. These windows do not have a good outlook due to their relationship with the boundary. The solid wall of the extension will result in a loss of light to these however there will be separation created between the properties with this existing, unusual situation. The depth of extension at 3 metres would also normally constitute permitted development therefore on balance this relationship is acceptable. A condition is attached to ensure no side windows are installed.

It is noted that objectors have mentioned that the extension in addition to the previously approved annex building exceeds 50% of the area within the curtilage. This is a requirement to meet permitted development and not a consideration when determining a planning application. Therefore in this case this does not give grounds for objection here. Adequate amenity space will remain for both the occupiers of the annex and the host dwelling to share and live in connection with each other.

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 extension.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation Y

1. Proactive with amendments

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 21st July 2022

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 21 July 2022