Expiry Date – 27/5

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0535/21 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 91 Southwick Street, Southwick

Proposal: **Hip to gable enlargement with 1no. window to west elevation and first floor rear extension to north.**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 13/5

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to semi detached hipped roof bungalow on the west side of Southwick Street close in this established residential area. The property also has am attached garage on its south side.

The property is not in a conservation area, is not listed and there are no protected trees on the site.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought to raise the gable and to build over a ground floor rear addition. The first floor rear extension has been reduced in depth since first submitted from 7.25 metres to 5.5 metres. This revision was not invited. Rooflights are shown in either roofslope of the first floor addition together with a gable window.

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/0022/21 - Householder application for permitted development for prior approval for single storey extension to rear of property measuring 6m from rear wall of the original dwelling, maximum height 4m and height of eaves of the extension 2.63m. No Prior Approval Required.

AWDM/1823/20 - Lawful Development Certificate for proposed loft conversion including hip to gable enlargement to south-west with 1no. window, 1no. dormer to rear and 3no. rooflights to south-east roof slope. Construction of a single storey side extension to south-west elevation. Issued.

Consultations

None undertaken.

Representations

Several objections from No. 89 summarised as follows:

- Loss of light
- Overbearing
- Loss of privacy
- Inaccurate drawings
- Inaccurate reflection of rooms at 89
- Cumulative effect of this proposal and previous two overwhelming.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2019
Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and 15 including 'Development Management Standard No. 2 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

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.

Character

This pair of bungalows sits begins a row of 9 bungalows heading southwards. Some have been extended into the roof in a similar way to that proposed here under the previously approved Lawful Development (see history above). First floor rear extensions are not seen.

'Policy 15: Quality of the Built Environment and Public Realm
Development should be of a high architectural quality and respect and enhance the character of the site, and the prevailing character of the area, in terms of proportion, form, context, massing, siting, layout, density, height, size, scale, materials, detailed design features and landscaping. Development should:
• Enhance the local environment by way of its appearance and character, with particular attention being paid to the architectural form, height, materials, density, scale, orientation, landscaping and layout of the development;

This pair of semi detached bungalows are currently unextended at roof level or to the rear. The raised gable proposed would be permitted development on its own and there are other examples of similar extensions to these bungalows in the street.

The first floor extension however, would be out of keeping with the character of these bungalows and would not respect nor enhance local character.

Neighbour amenity

Adopted Local Plan policy 15 asks that development

• *Make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area; and not have an unacceptable impact on adjacent properties, particularly residential dwellings, including unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, outlook or open amenity space;*

It also states:

When considering applications for extensions or alterations to dwellings, proposals will be expected to comply with the criteria contained in the Council's adopted Development Management Standard No.2 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" (as amended or superseded by other Council guidance in force at the time an application is considered) or any other appropriate national standard.'

Development Management Standard No.2 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" reiterates the design advice in adopted policy 15 and the NPPF. Specifically in relation to rear extensions it states in para 3.2

The closer a rear extension is to a neighbouring property the more likely it is to adversely affect that property, by way of overlooking or loss of daylight…….
Two storey (or first floor rear extensions) that are within 1 metre of a side boundary of an attached dwelling should normally be no deeper than 2metres, extensions abutting the boundary will not normally be permitted.

No. 89, to the south has added a 6 metre deep rear extension. Its kitchen/diner windows are in the original side wall of the bungalow and would face the extension. The extension would be harmful to the light and outlook for No. 89 and would be overbearing.

Recommendation REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The proposed form, context, massing, siting, size and scale of the first floor extension would be an incongruous addition to this bungalow which would fail to preserve or enhance its character. Its scale, form and position would also have an unneighbourly impact on the living conditions of occupiers of No. 89 due to a loss of light, outlook and overbearing impact. It is contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan and adopted Development Management Standard No.2 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the

harm which has been clearly identified within the reason(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? No.

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 11.6.21
Authorised and signed by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 11 June 2021