Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1793/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 19 Millcroft Avenue, Southwick

Proposal: Demolition of existing sunroom, proposed single storey rear extension, relocation of entrance from side to front elevation, installation of windows, rooflights to existing north roof slope.

Date of site visit: 16.01.17

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposal

The application relates to a detached, hipped roof bungalow within a street of similar dwellings in the built up area of Southwick, the ground level rises to the north. As existing there is off street parking to the front of the bungalow. There is a shared driveway to the south leading to a detached, single garage. There is a flat roof, brick built rear addition as existing with a lean to glazed extension attached to the rear.

Consent is sought to remove the existing glazed rear extension, retain the flat roof addition and build a double hipped roof rear extension the full width of the bungalow. The extension is proposed at 3 metres in depth in addition to the existing flat roof extension. It is shown on the plans to have a maximum height of 4.2 metres. Bi fold doors are proposed to the rear with side windows and rooflights.

The proposed works will provide an open plan lounge, kitchen and living space. The floor plans show a rearrangement of the floor space with the main entrance moved from the side elevation to the front elevation and the replacement of the front window with a front door. This results in the loss of the front bedroom and creation of an additional bedroom where the original lounge was. Additional side windows are proposed within the main bungalow and also the rear addition.

The plans also show rooflights to the original roof slope of the bungalow on the northern elevation. Although these are shown to be serving the roof void there is concern that these could overlook the side dormer to the north. A condition has been attached to ensure that these roof lights are to be obscurely glazed and non openable (except that part which is above 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed.)

Consultations: None

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
Submission Adur Local Plan 2016 – Policy 15
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extension which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The extension is to the rear of the bungalow. It will not be visible within the street scene. Due to the dual pitch roof design the ridge height of the extension is kept low, much lower than the main ridge. Part of the roof is to be constructed over the existing flat roof extension, therefore the new addition is limited to 3 metres in depth. The proposed extension is not considered to be overly large and bulky in scale, it would not warrant a refusal in terms of its visual impact.

As mentioned above the main entrance is to be relocated to the frontage of the bungalow. Although this is an original feature which is commonplace within this street there are other examples of main entrances to the front, no. 21 adjacent to the north has a similar situation. This is not an alteration that would detrimental to the street scene to any significant degree.

Residential Amenity

The main properties to be affected in this case are no. 21 to the north and no. 17 to the south. No 21 is at higher ground level and has a completed rear extension of similar design and scale to that proposed here. Consent was granted for an extension 4 metres in depth from the original rear elevation at no. 21, ADC/0042/10, The originally proposed 6 metre extension could not be supported. A subsequent application was submitted, ADC/0162/10 proposing again for the extension at 6 metres this was refused and an appeal was dismissed on the grounds of impact on residential amenity.

The current proposed extension, including the rear flat roof addition will be 5.2 metres beyond the original rear wall of the bungalow. Greater than that at no. 21, yet the main property to be affected is no. 21 to the north due to the close proximity. As this bungalow has already been extended the impact is therefore limited with the side elevations of the extensions abutting, with that at no. 19 extending slightly further to the rear due to the integration of the existing flat roof addition. New side windows are to be obscurely glazed as they are at no. 21 so no mutual overlooking will result.

To the south no. 17 is at a lower level than the application side, yet due to the side driveway there is some separation between the properties and there is a side boundary fence and garages positioned between the properties. No. 17 also has a rear conservatory and from the application site only the roof of this structure is visible. Although the overall depth of the extension is to be 5.2 metres beyond the original rear wall it is considered, on balance that the proposed roof design results in low level ridge heights and despite the ground level changes the separation is such to not result in an overbearing form of development in relation to no. 17.
The changes to the internal layout of the bungalow have given rise to additional windows to the sides. The applicant's agent has confirmed that the applicant proposes that all new side windows are to be obscurely glazed, apart from the rooflights which will not result in any overlooking. A condition is also attached to ensure this. There will therefore be no loss of privacy to adjacent dwellings.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. Standard time limit
2. Materials to match
3. Obscure glaze side windows and top opening only.
4. No addition windows in north and south elevation
5. Approved plans

Informative

1. Proactive no amendments

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 23rd January 2017

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 24.01.2017