expires 15/9

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0372/08 **Recommendation - Application Refused**

Site: **20 Beach Green Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5YG**

Proposal: **First-floor livingroom within gable-roofed side extension (with rear dormer and balcony) and bedroom within existing roofspace (with rear dormers)**

The Application

The site is located in the built up area of Shoreham Beach on the north side of Beach Green within an established close consisting of three terraces of houses around a green square.

The application site consists of a three storey end of terrace house with an integral garage and existing single storey side extension that attaches it to the closest house in the adjacent terrace at 90 degrees (No. 18). This extension projects forward of the front of the original house. To the side of this there is a small existing conservatory.

To the other side is the attached terraced house and to the rear is a garden with a raised bank at the rear along the top of which runs a public footpath. Beyond this runs the river with a number of houseboats moored nearby. The site fronts onto the existing square with parking and a grassed area opening onto Beach Green road to the south. The application property is set well back from Beach Green.

Permission was refused in 2007 for a first floor side extension over the existing side extension with a green roof and an open roof terrace area to the rear. A rear single storey rear extension was also proposed to provide a garden room that would extend to the rear boundary. This would also have a green roof and a second roof terrace area. The first floor extension would project forward of the front of the original house and abut No. 18 at the front corner. Also proposed was the conversion of the loft space with a flat roofed dormer to the rear (ADC/306/07).

Earlier this year, permission was refused for a three-storey side extension over the existing side extension, comprising a sitting room with rear balcony at first floor, a family room at second floor and a bedroom and ensuite within the existing and proposed rooflsope. Two rear dormer windows were also proposed (ADC/0140/08).

Permission is now sought for a first floor extension over the flat roofed side extension comprising a pitched roofed extension with side gable, rear dormer

and balcony. From the side, the extension has a triangular appearance. It projects forward of the front of the original house and abuts No.18 at the front corner but the applicants have confirmed that it will not overhang the adjoining property.

Two pairs of rooflights are proposed for the front roofIsope with a new window on the existing front elevation. The loft space of the existing building is also to be converted into a bedroom with two flat roofed dormers proposed for the rear roofIsope.

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

None

Third Parties

1 letter of objection received from the occupier of 18 Beach Green which raises the following points:- unneighbourly and unsightly development, out of character with the area. It would be overbearing and give rise to overlooking and loss of light. Impact will be exacerbated by proximity to No.18. Development encroaches onto land owned by No.18.

1 letter also received from the occupier of 35 Riverbank (houseboat at rear) which states that while they have no objection to the extension, the balcony is likely to be intrusive and will overlook their property.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005) (saved policies): LOC1, DEV1
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'
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies

Structure Plan policies seek to protect, and where possible, enhance the character and distinctiveness of an area, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general.

Government policy is set out in Planning Policy Statement PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development'. Relevant paragraphs are 17, which refers to the commitment to protecting and improving the environment; 18 which states that planning should seek to maintain and improve the local environment and help to mitigate the effects of declining environmental quality through positive policies on issues such as design; and 34 which states that good design is indivisible from good planning and that design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area, should not be accepted.

Visual amenity

While the sloping roof of the proposed extension is less intrusive than the proposal refused in 2007, it would still have the effect of joining No.20 and No. 18, closing the corner of the square in visual terms. It has already been done to some extent by the single storey extension but would be far more noticeable with the first floor extension, particularly due to the forward projection. This change would adversely affect the character and appearance of the close and its spacious feel and square formation resulting from the original three separate terraces.

The proposed side extension is considered to be out of keeping with both the existing house and the general appearance of the whole close. The inclusion of four rooflights is considered to be excessive and results in a cluttered and highly visible rooflsope. It should be set back behind the front elevation of the main building in order to maintain this visual gap between the properties.

The flat roofed dormer windows are well proportioned and leave a reasonable amount of the roof visible. These will be the first dormer windows within the terrace, but other roof extensions and flat roofed additions are visible within the surrounding area and they are subsequently not considered to detract from the visual amenities of the locality.

Residential amenity

The main residential impact is overlooking and loss of privacy. The rear balcony in particular would result in a reduction in privacy to No. 18 as no privacy screen is proposed along the side of the balcony. The balcony would also overlook the houseboats on the river directly to the north of the site. However, a balcony was recently approved at No.22 Beach Green (ADC/0123/08) and it is not considered that the houseboats, which are

already overlooked by rear windows on the properties in Beach Green and by the public footpath along the river, would suffer a significant loss of privacy or amenity.

The garden at No. 18 is partly overlooked already by No. 16 and the house to the rear in Beach Green. The main private area is therefore to the side and this would be overlooked by the balcony that would be located at the side of No. 20 and by the side windows in the rear dormer which accesses the balcony. However, a round window proposed in the apex of the side gable would be high level and would not result in overlooking.

The bulk of the extension is reduced by its roof form and it is not considered that it would be unduly overbearing to the occupiers of No.20. The extension is to the north west of No.18 and is set well down below the main ridge height of No.20. Consequently, it would not significantly affect the amount of sunlight reaching No.18, although there may be some loss of sunlight at the end of the day as a result of the forward projection of the roof of the extension into the existing gap between the properties.

Conclusion

It is concluded that the proposed development would be an unsympathetic development of the site that would result in a building out of keeping in the streetscene and in a loss of residential amenity to the adjacent dwelling through overlooking and loss of privacy.

Recommendation

REFUSE on grounds that: -

1. B2R
2. H18R (amended). Remove loss of light and an overbearing effect from reason.

Case Officer..... Date. 21/8/08

21/8