Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0226/10 **Recommendation – APPROVE**

Site: **161 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 5HL**

Proposal: **Front porch, east side extension and new pitched roof to accommodate rooms in roof with side rooflights and front balcony**

The Application

The application property is a detached flat-roofed bungalow on the north side of the road, adjacent to a hip-roofed bungalow (No.159) to the west, on the corner of Falcon Close. To the east, is another bungalow (No.161) with a gabled roof. To the rear are chalet bungalows.

It is proposed to add a first floor within a new fully-pitched roof (ridge height 7m) with front and rear gables, also encompassing a proposed side extension 2.05m wide and 12.5m deep, almost the full depth of the dwelling.

The rooms in the newly-created roofspace would comprise a large open-plan living-dining room with kitchen, served by a large glazed front window area with curved front balcony and by side rooflights, plus a separate study with small rear window and rooflights. The enlarged groundfloor would comprise 4 bedrooms, all with ensuite facilities and a utility/shower-room plus sauna. At the front, a porch is proposed to be added (beneath the proposed balcony) plus a bay window.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: 3 letters have been received.

The residents of No.159 (2 letters) to the west comment that they are delighted the proposal is significantly smaller than previous preliminary proposals the applicant showed them and they do not anticipate an adverse impact on their light or privacy (subject to confirmation from the Council). However, they are concerned about the impact the proposed close-boarded fence (replacing the boundary wall) might have on the established planting scheme and their second letter follows a meeting they have had with the applicant to agree boundary treatment details.

The resident of No.3 Falcon Close to the rear, whilst not opposing the proposal in principle, objects to the proposed rear study window and east side rooflights on grounds of overlooking and disturbance of sleep. She states that they would look into her upstairs rear bedroom window (and also a bathroom window in a second rear dormer for which she has permission) and that frosted glass is required. She questions the height of the ridge being taller than No.163; whether the colour of the roof tiles will be in keeping; and whether the residents of No.4 should have been notified as they would also be overlooked.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

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

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, 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 and should comply with the Council's DC standards.
The Council's DC Standard No.3 states that a distance of 22m is normally required between facing principal windows, to retain privacy, and that side elevations should be set back 1m from side boundaries to avoid a cramped appearance and allow access for maintenance.

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 and character

The existing building has a poor quality flat-roofed form and appearance and detracts from the streetscene, although it is not prominent because of its low profile. The proposed pitched roof would improve the appearance and make it more in keeping with the majority of dwellings on this side of the road, albeit that it would differ from the adjacent ones, including by its greater ridge height and front gable.

Although the east side addition would bring the building only 0.45m from the east side boundary, it would not appear cramped because of the low eaves line. The details of the design with extensive front glazing and balcony would add visual interest, making it more distinctive, as well as giving it a more contemporary feel.

Residential amenity

In terms of the effect on the chalet bungalows to the rear, No's 2 and 3 Falcon Close, their original main rear walls are 27m/28m away respectively, more than the Council's minimum standard of 22m. No.3, the one directly behind, has a firstfloor dormer window approximately 30m away from the proposed firstflocr study window. It has a rear conservatory but this is 25m away and shielded by tall hedges on the intervening boundaries.

No.4 Falcon Close is offset to the east. It has a very large rear dormer, 30m away at its closest, and a large flat-roofed groundfloor rear extension but this is 25m away at its closest corner and screened by hedges.

The rear garden of the application site is only 5m deep but the applicant has minimised potential for overlooking by designing the rear elevation with only a single very narrow first-floor window (0.5m wide and 2m high) serving the study. It is not

considered that this would cause unacceptable overlooking subject to its lower portion being obscure-glazed and fixed

With regard to the rooflights (in groups of 4) in the side elevations, at their lowest, these are shown with their glazing 1.4m above the floor level of the rooms they serve (living/dining/ kitchen and study). The downward angle of view from within the rooms would not enable unacceptable overlooking unless the rooflights were opened and the person stood within the opened area.

The front balcony would be set back behind the southernmost wall of the bungalow at No.159 which has no windows in its facing side elevation. Although there would be some potential overlooking of the front garden of No.159, it is not considered that this warrants refusal. The proposed front decking would benefit from having a screen fence on the adjacent part of the boundary.

No.163 has a high-level side window and a side window in its rear addition, slightly further from the boundary. The closer proximity of the proposal and the pitched roof would cause some effect on sun/daylighting and a more enclosing effect. However, it is not considered that it would be to a degree warranting refusal because of the low eaves line of the proposal (2.6m as compared to the existing parapet wall height of 3.3m).

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and without detraction from highway safety. It would consequently not conflict with the policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7).

Subject to:-

1. C1Ci
2. C12Ei ....be completed in accordance with the details shown on the approved plan and with the roof tiles coloured grey unless otherwise...
3. C18C3 The rear study window to a height of 1.2m (above the floor level cf the study) shall at all.....
4. Unless otherwise approved in writing by the LPA, a 1.8m high close-boarded fence shall be erected on the west side boundary where it is adjacent to the proposed decking, prior to commencement of construction of the decking. R. as 3 above.
5. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
   OS Sitemap; Drawing No's 210/398/1 (Existing plans); 210/398/2 (Proposed Floor Plans); 210/398/4 (Roof plan, etc); and 210/398/5 (Block Plan) all date stamped received 28 June 2010.
   Drawing No.210/398/6A (Proposed cross section) date stamped received 23 August 2010
   Drawing No.210/398/3B (Proposed Elevations) date stamped received 23 August 2010
   R. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Case Officer: Keith Morgan Date: 23 August 2010