Expires 10/1/06

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0438/06 **Recommendation - Application Refused**

Site: **93 Slonk Hill Road Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 6HY**

Proposal: **Two-storey gabled rear extension with first-floor balcony**

The Application

The property consists of a detached bungalow with brick elevations and a tiled gable roof. The property is located on the south side of Slonk Hill Road with access over a shared driveway with no. 91 Slonk Hill Road to the east.

The application proposes a two storey gabled rear extension. The extension will protrude approximately 5m from the existing rear elevation. The ridge of the gabled roof will protrude 500mm above the existing ridgeline. A balcony is proposed along the first floor of the rear elevation.

The two storey rear extension is to provide a new bedroom and en-suite on the ground floor and a living room on the first floor.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties

Two third party letters have been received, both objecting to the proposed extension. The first letter from a neighbour to the rear of the site, is objecting due to overlooking impacts from the extension, the proximity of the extension to their shared boundary and the inconsistent scale of the proposed roof over the extension. The second letter is from the neighbour to the east and outlines concerns in relation to the rear extension's impact on loss of light and privacy to their property. Concerns are also expressed about the use of the shared access way and dust and noise emanating from the site during construction.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adur District Local Plan: AG1, AH7, AT12
West Sussex Structure Plan: DEV1, DEV 4-5

Planning Assessment

The relevant planning issues of this application are the impact of the extension on adjoining residential amenity, the character of the dwelling, the street scene and the availability of car parking.

Impact on the character of the dwelling and street scene
The south side of Slonk Hill Road is characterised by detached bungalows all of the same design. The land falls to the south from Slonk Hill Road and also falls slightly to the east.

The proposed first floor rear extension is considered to be inconsistent with Council's Development Control Standards which state that extensions should be 'subordinate' to the existing dwelling so as not to 'spoil its proportions' and to avoid a cramped effect and overdevelopment of the site. As the ground falls to the south the height above natural ground level of the extension is approximately 5.6m at the southern most point causing the extension to be of a substantial scale. The ridge line is also approximately 500mm above the existing ridgeline of the bungalow again adding to the visual bulk of the proposed extension. Given the bulk and in particular the height and length of the proposed extension, it is considered to be overdevelopment of the site.

The impact on the street scape is considered to be minimal. Although the ridge of the roof is to be raised above the existing roof line of the dwelling, as it is located to the south of the dwelling it will not have a significant visual impact on the street scape.

Impact on residential amenity
The comments received from third parties in relation to overlooking impacts as a result of the extension are noted. It is accepted that that the proposed first floor balcony will have some overlooking impact to the rear. There is approximately a distance of 27m between the proposed rear extension and the dwelling to the south which exceeds Council's required distance between principle facing windows. The balcony is additionally proposed to have walls either side to reduce any overlooking impact on the adjacent neighbours to the east and west. The overlooking impacts as a result of the extension would not be significant enough to warrant refusal.

The comments received about the impact on adjoining residential amenity are noted and whilst there is not considered to be a significant detrimental impact on adjoining privacy or daylight, the proposal is considered to have an overbearing effect on general visual amenity. The proposed first floor extension is to extend 5m from the existing rear elevation within 80cm of the western side boundary. Council's development control standards require that any first floor extension within 1m of the boundary should only extend approximately 2m. The proximity to the neighbours boundary and length of the extension will cause an overbearing impact on adjoining residential amenity.

The comments received about use of the shared access way, noise and dust emanating from the site during construction, are not relevant planning considerations and therefore are not discussed here.

Car parking requirements
Council's Development Control Standard No. 1 – 'Car Parking Standards' requires that 3 car parking spaces be provided for dwellings with four bedrooms or more. The proposed extension will provide one additional bedroom taking the total number of bedrooms to four, which will require an additional car parking space. It is difficult to see how the property could facilitate an additional parking space on site, conversely, as the car parking standards are to be treated as a maximum only, the amount of parking available on site would not by itself warrant refusal.

On balance, the proposed development is considered to be inconsistent with the existing scale and design of the dwelling. The bulk of the rear extension will over-dominate the dwelling and cause an overbearing impact on adjoining residential amenity. The proposal is an overdevelopment of the site and should be refused.

Recommendation

REFUSE on ground that :-

1. B5BR

Case Officer [redacted] .....

Date: 21/12/04 .....

[redacted] 21/12