Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0097/15 Recommendation – Approve

Site: 21 The Meadway, Shoreham-By-Sea
West Sussex, BN43 5RN

Proposal: Two-storey extension to front (north) elevation. Extend existing side dormers to east and west elevations. Single-storey extension to rear (south) elevation with first-floor balcony above.

Date of site visit: 11 February 2015

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is a detached bungalow with rooms in the roof on the south side of The Meadway. There are existing flat roofed dormer windows on both the east and west sides of the roof, plus a first floor Juliet balcony and doors within the gable at the rear of the building.

It is proposed to increase the size of the side dormers and to add a mono-pitched roof over both. The dormers will measure 8.1m wide, 2.7m high and 2m deep on the west side and 6.3m wide, 2.7m high and 2m deep on the east side. Also proposed is a front extension, bringing the front gable of the building forward by 1.5m, as amended. Finally, a single storey rear extension is proposed measuring 2.5m deep and 2.9m high, running across the full width of the property. It will have a balcony on the roof measuring 3.8m wide and 2.2m deep with obscure glazed side screens 1.7m high.

Relevant site history

SU/54/06 - Rooms in Roof Involving New Gabled Roof with Higher Ridge and Side Dormers – approved

AWDM/0878/11 - Demolish existing porch and construction of a front extension and new open porch – approved

Consultations

Adur & Worthing Councils: The **Environmental Health Officer** requires the PFA informative to be imposed

Representations

2 letters received from the occupiers of 19 The Meadway and 116 Old Fort Road objecting on the following grounds:

- Loss of light
- Partial demolition of boundary wall owned by No.19
- Sewer pipe runs through gardens of 19-25 The Meadway and would be beneath proposed extension
- Overdevelopment of a very small plot with no space either side

Relevant Planning Policies

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' National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading of the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

The existing dwelling is taller than its neighbours by virtue of having been extended in 2006. The current proposal will not increase its height any further but it will increase the size and prominence of the side dormers. However, the proposal does not bring the dormers to the front edge of the building and instead limits their increase more towards the rear of the roof which helps to minimise their prominence. They will be wider and taller than existing but they will be partly screened by the roofs of the neighbouring buildings and will not appear unduly obtrusive in the street scene.

The proposed front extension has been reduced in depth since the original submission and will bring the house forward by 1.5m. This will bring it in line with its neighbours and, while a larger building than its neighbours, it will not be unduly prominent in the street scene.

The plot is relatively narrow and the bungalow is close to the side of No.23 in particular. However, the proposed extensions will not close that gap, being at the front and rear only. The dormer extensions will be larger but, because of their generous set back from the front of the property, they will not have a harmful visual impact. The proposal is not considered to result in overdevelopment of the property.

Residential amenity

The rear extension measures 2.5m deep and would be permitted development if no balcony was included. Consequently, the neighbour's objections on grounds of loss of light can only be given limited weight given the fallback position. Furthermore, the affected room at No.19 is a sun room which has large amounts of glazing at the side and south-facing rear. The

impact on light arising from this proposal is not considered to be harmful to the occupiers of No.19.

The proposed balcony will have obscure glazed side screens to prevent overlooking. No.19 has a larger, unscreened balcony which will not be adversely affected by this single storey extension.

The proposed dormer extensions will result in larger additions on the roof slopes of No.21. However, it is not considered that they will result in any significant increase in light loss or overlooking to neighbouring occupiers, particularly as all but one of the dormers are shown as being obscure glazed. The dormer to be clear glazed is on the east side and replaces an existing clear glazed dormer in a similar position. The reduced front extension will also not have an adverse impact on light or outlook for either neighbour.

The issue of possible encroachment onto land owned by No.19 is a civil matter while the possible building over a sewer is a matter to be dealt with at the Building Regulations stage. Discussions with Building Control Officers suggest that this is not a matter of concern.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Materials to match existing dwelling
3. Obscure glazed windows with exception of window to bedroom 4 on east elevation
4. Obscure glazed screens to balcony
5. Approved plans

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

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.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 25 March 2015

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 25 March 2015