Expires 25/4/07.

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0121/07 Recommendation - Refuse

Site: **337 Upper Shoreham Road Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5NB**

Proposal: **Two-storey rear extension, roof terrace and conversion of existing garage to habitable room**

The Application

The property consists of a detached two storey house with brick elevations and a tiled gabled roof. The property is located on the south side of Upper Shoreham Road, adjacent to a corner plot.

The application proposes to construct a two storey rear extension. The ground floor of the extension will extend an existing ground floor rear extension approximately 2.6m to the west across the rear elevation, retaining the original depth of the extension at 4.8m. The first floor extension will be constructed on the western side of the ground floor extension and will measure 2.8m in depth and 2.9m in width. The first floor extension is to have a pitched roof with eves level with the eve line of the house and a roof pitch set 1.2m below the ridge line. A roof terrace will be formed over the ground floor extension with railings running along the eastern and southern sides and along the western side of the first floor extension. The application also proposes to convert the existing ground floor garage to a habitable room by replacing the garage door with a window and matching brickwork.

The extension is to provide additional kitchen/dining space on the ground floor and an additional bathroom on the first floor.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties

One third party letter has been received from the neighbours to the west of the property at no. 60 Mill Lane, Shoreham, which objects strongly to the proposal for the following reasons:-

- The proposed extension will cause a severe loss of light to the windows located on the eastern side of their dwelling;
- The proposed roof terrace would be completely out of keeping with the character of the houses in the area and overlook their rear garden and existing conservatory;
- The bathroom window is much larger than the existing window in the first floor; and

- The property has already been extended substantially by a ground floor extension.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

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

Planning Assessment

The key planning issues of this application are the impact of the proposed extension on the character of the dwelling and near area; the adjacent residential amenity; and the effect on highway safety as a result of converting the existing garage.

Character of the dwelling and area
The proposed rear extension and garage conversion is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the existing character of the dwelling. The design of the proposed extension, including the materials proposed to be used and the appearance of the windows appears to match the existing design of the house. The proposed roof terrace is however, out of keeping with the character of the area. Although the adjacent property to the west contains railings around the top of the roof section – this area is not accessed and not used as a roof terrace. The proposed roof terrace would be the only terrace in the near area and therefore inconsistent with the predominant design of the dwellings in the vicinity.

Impact on adjoining residential amenity
The concerns raised in the letter from the adjacent neighbours are noted. The adjacent corner plot to the west has a triangular shape and as such the house angles in towards no. 337 Upper Shoreham Road. For this reason, the proposed first floor extension would have a significant impact on the access to light and the outlook from the adjacent ground floor windows, causing the extension to have an overbearing and unneighbourly appearance from the adjacent property. The adjacent neighbours to the east no. 335 Upper Shoreham Road will not be significantly affected by the proposed extension in terms of access to daylight and outlook, as the only alteration on the eastern side of the property is the addition of the railings along the top of the existing ground floor extension.

The use of the roof of the ground floor extension as a roof terrace however, is considered to have an unacceptable impact on both the adjacent properties' privacy. The roof terrace is proposed to be enclosed by railings which will allow users of the roof terrace to overlook both the neighbouring rear garden areas. The property to the south of the site no. 58 Mill Lane is orientated to face Mill Lane to the east, resulting in its side windows facing the rear of the dwelling at 337 Upper Shoreham Road. There is approximately a 16m separation distance from the side windows at no. 58 Mill Lane to the rear elevation of the dwelling at 337 Upper Shoreham Road. As this distance exceeds the recommended 14m separation distance between side and rear

facing windows in Council's Development Control Standard No. 2 'Space Around New Dwellings and Flats', the proposed rear extension and roof terrace would not be considered to have an unacceptable overlooking impact on the property to the rear.

Highway safety
The conversion of the garage to a habitable room is not considered to have a detrimental impact on existing highway safety. The house contains four bedrooms and Councils Car Parking Standards require a maximum of three car parking spaces to be provided for the dwelling. As the house is set back almost 8m from the road and the plot is approximately 10m in width, the required three car parking spaces could potentially be provided on the hard surfaced area to the front of the dwelling.

On balance, it is considered that the proposed rear extension is unacceptable as the creation of the roof terrace will have a detrimental impact on the privacy of the adjacent properties. The proposed first floor extension will additionally result in a loss of light and outlook to the eastern side windows of the adjacent property and as such cause an overbearing and unneighbourly impact on the adjacent residential amenity. The proposal should be refused.

Recommendation

REFUSE on ground that:-

1. H20R '...by reason of its unneighbourly design and siting, would be...'

Case Officer: .....

Date: 29/8/17

29/8