Expiry Date – 17/7

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0628/18 Recommendation – Grant

Site: 9 Cypress Close, Shoreham

Proposal: Rear two storey extension and side single storey extension.

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 15/6

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a detached house on the east side of Cypress Avenue. The house is one of five identical houses built in the 1960's. As built the houses have two storey gabled front projections with a subordinate recessed chalet style roof with front and rear dormers. They are generously positioned off each boundary with driveways and detached rear garages on their north sides and pedestrian width gates on the south sides. Their 'front' doors are in their north side walls. Land rises up to the north with the application site being on slightly lower ground than No. 8, to the north.

The houses are in a cul de sac and positioned around a central green. Other houses in the street are bungalows many of which have been extended into the roof. The site backs on to Buckingham Park.

The properties are not in a conservation area and are not listed. There are no protected trees on the site.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought to add a single storey north side extension and two storey rear extension to this property. The application has been revised since first submitted.

The side extension is now set back from the front of the house by 2 metres. It has also been pulled off the shared boundary to avoid any potential for encroachment and is now 650mm off the northern boundary. The front door has been repositioned into the front wall of the extension. The side extension extends 3.5 metres beyond the rear wall. It is 2.8 metres high to eaves and 3.6 metres high to ridge. A first floor rear extension has also been reduced in depth from 4 metres to 3.5 metres. It does not extend beyond the existing north flank wall. The roof of this extension has been changed from a gable and is now hipped back. It follows the eaves and ridge line of the main roof.

The garage is to be demolished. Fencing is to be erected where the garage currently forms the boundary.

Relevant Planning History

ADC/0500/10 – Replacement detached garage. Granted 18.3.11

Consultations

None undertaken.

Representations

Objection to the original application received from No. 8, reiterated to the revisions by phone. Summarised as follows:

1. The side extension would abut my boundary and make it impossible to maintain 8's fence.
2. Maintenance of the downpipes on the north side of the extension would also be impossible for the applicant without encroaching on No. 8's property.
3. Noise from pipes in close proximity to the living room and bedroom at 8 would be disturbing.
4. Access to the applicant's garage would be impossible. Is it to be shortened and used for an alternative purpose or removed?
5. The garage forms part of the boundary. If removed will it be replaced with fencing?
6. Loss of light to south and east facing living room windows.
7. Loss of light to garden, consequent damage to lawn and plants.
8. The plans show no windows in the side wall facing No. 8 but we are concerned about loss of privacy in the rear garden.
9. Ground cover proposed will affect soil drainage. Groundwater is stressed already due to high demand from the trees in Buckingham Park and in the green at the front.
10. Additional stresses will be place on endangered species of bees, hedgehogs and woodpeckers around the park.
11. Impact on visual balance of houses. 6-9 Cypress Close have similar configurations. The side extension would crowd the outlook and give the property and area a more urban character.
12. The reposition of the front door should be clearly shown. The plans are not sufficiently detailed and need to show all dimensions and the plot's boundary.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2018
Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and 15 including 'Development Management Standard No. 2 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development can be supported as it upgrades a dwelling within the built up area boundary. For consideration is the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area and the impacts of the development on neighbour amenity.

Neighbour amenity

The revised application sets the single storey side extension back from the front wall by 2 metres and off the shared side boundary with No. 8 by 650mm. It extends 3.5 metres beyond the rear wall. No. 8 is set off the common boundary by 1 metre and has a gated side access adjoining the boundary. The rear walls currently line through.

The living room at No. 8, as common in these identical 5 houses, is a through room with windows front and rear. It also has a high level side window. In terms of the ground floor side extension proposed light to the front living room window at No.8 will be entirely unaffected. Afternoon sun to the rear living room will be little more affected than currently as the ground floor extension in part replaces a garage which forms the boundary 1.2 metres beyond the rear wall. This garage is to be removed and fencing added to secure the boundary. The high level side window will suffer a loss of light though not entirely given the 1.8 metres separation and difference in levels.

The first floor rear extension has been revised to include a hipped roof to lessen its mass. It too has been reduced in depth to 3.5 metres but does not extend beyond the original flank wall. It is therefore off the shared boundary with No.8 by 2.8 metres and 4 metres from the flank wall of No. 8. The rear bedroom window at 8 is a dormer window. This same bedroom has a front facing dormer.

The first floor extension does not break a 45 degree line when measured from the mid point of either the ground floor living room window or the first floor dormer. Also both rooms are lit and ventilated from the front. No significant loss of light will result.

Given the separation distance it is also not considered that the first floor extension will be unduly overbearing to No. 8. The alteration to its roof form has reduced the bulk. The first floor extension does not include side windows and so neighbours will not be overlooked. No north side ground floor windows are proposed either. Rooflights are shown in the sloping roof. These will not cause overlooking.

No. 10, to the south, angles away from the site and is well removed from the proposed extensions. It will not be harmed at all.

Character/ Appearance

These five houses are identical as built and unaltered. However, PD restrictions do not apply and so a side extension would not need planning permission.

The side extension has been revised since first submitted and is now set back from the front of the house by 2 metres. This set back retains the original form of the house and

lessens the impact on the appearance of the street. The 650mm inset from the north boundary also ensures it does not appear too cramped to the plot. The 1.2 metre gap off the southern boundary is unaltered. The set in also ensures no encroachment over the common boundary with No. 8.

Relocating the front door to the new front wall will set this house apart from its neighbours which as built have their front doors in the side wall. It is considered that this will not cause significant harm to the appearance of the streetscene particularly as the side extension is now recessed behind the front wall by 2 metres.

The first floor rear extension will be little glimpsed from the road. It may be visible from the park between the trees on the park boundary but a distance of 6 metres to the park boundary is retained. It will not be too prominent when viewed from the park.

Recommendation APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved Plans
2. 3 years
3. Materials to match
4. No side windows
5. Following demolition of the garage and within 7 days of the completion of the roof of the ground floor side extension the northern boundary shall be enclosed with a 1.8 metre high feather edge fence as confirmed by email dated 17/7/18 and retained as such thereafter.

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 any representations? Yes.

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 7.9.18
Authorised and signed by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 7 September 2018