Expiry Date – 29/11

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1469/16 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 18 Osborne Close, Sompting

Proposal: **Extension to south elevation with dormer to west roofslope and rooflights to (front) roofslope.**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 3/11

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a semi detached bungalow on the west side of Osborne Close in an established residential area of Sompting. The property is at the southern end of this cul de sac. Osborne Close is largely made up of 1950's bungalows and there are bungalows behind in Western Road North and Edwin Close to the south. An infill development of 8, 2-storey houses is across the road at Nos. 11-27 (odd).

This particular pair of bungalows is front gabled on one half and flat fronted on the other, the application site in this case. This is a common feature of the west side of the Close and also in Osborne Drive. The site has a deeper front garden than other houses with vehicle access directly off the head of the cul de sac and a detached garage in the front garden. It has a long side garden parallel with the rear garden boundary of 7 Edwin Close and a short rear garden repeated in Western Road North.

Land slopes into the garden from the street and ground level is higher than in Western Road North by more than 1 metre.

The site is not in a conservation area and is not listed. There are no protected trees on the site.

Proposal

Permission is sought to add a south side extension to within 900mm of the boundary with 7 Edwin Close. The extension projects forward of the front wall by 700mm and includes a front gable to reflect the gable at No. 16. It extends to the original rear wall. Its dimensions are a maximum 5.55 metres in width, 8.7 metres in length with matching eaves and ridge lines to the original bungalow.

The new side wall repeats the full gable feature of the existing side wall and includes 3 new windows at ground floor level only. The rear dormer extension and front gable feature elongate this side elevation.

The accommodation provides two additional first floor bedrooms and a lounge, bedroom and bathroom at ground floor. A second staircase is shown within the extension as, according to the applicant, head height in the new floorspace is unachievable from the existing staircase. The accommodation is accessible from within the existing bungalow at ground floor level only.

The proposal appears to follow fairly closely the design for a new end of terrace house refused in 2002. The drawings relating to that file were destroyed in a flood, though the report is still available.

This application was submitted following pre-application advice. The applicant was advised that his proposal was unlikely to be acceptable to the Council.

Relevant Planning History

ADC/0222/08 - Two-bedroom bungalow (with room in roof) to side of existing dwelling. Refused 1.7.08

Consultations

Sompting Parish Council – No objection but south elevation shower room window should be obscurely glazed.

Representations

4 objections received. 3 from Western Road North and 1 from 7 Edwin Close summarized as follows:

1. Overlooking. Already overlooked from the rooflights, platform and from the trampoline. This will make it worse.
2. Very close proximity, privacy will be lost.
3. Properties are well separated at the moment by the existing side garden. Building to within 900mm of side boundary will be oppressive in scale, too close to boundary and too close to rear of 7.
4. Loss of privacy from side windows.
5. Detrimental impact on external appearance and visual impact of the new extension towards No.7
6. Front velux will be openable and will be able to look straight into our side bathroom and back door.
7. Concerned about stability of No. 7's property (fence etc.) whilst excavations take place.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012
Saved Local Plan policies AG1, AH2, AH5 and AH7 and Appendix 11 including Supplementary Planning Guidance comprising 'Development Control Standard No. 3 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.
Emerging Adur Local Plan Policies 1, 2 and 15

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development can be supported as it upgrades a dwelling within the built up area boundary.

Of consideration are the impacts of the proposal on neighbours and on the appearance of the property and the wider streetscene.

Policy Context

Development Control Standard No. 3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' includes saved Adur Local Plan policy AH7 and expands design advice for domestic extensions as follows:

'*Saved policy AH7 states:*

Extensions and alterations to existing houses and bungalows will be expected to be designed so that:-
(a) proposals would not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, loss of natural light or overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings;
(b) design and materials are sympathetic to both the original dwelling and the area in general;
(c) the proportion of the garden area taken by the proposal would not be excessive having regard to the character of the area;
(d) access and car parking provision is acceptable under Policy AT12, and
(e) proposals accord with the standards adopted by the District Planning

PLANNING PRINCIPLES

THE EFFECT ON NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES

2.2 Proposals will not be granted planning permission if they have an unacceptably adverse effect on neighbouring properties. The main detrimental effects could be related to:-

(i) ***Privacy***
The proposal should not result in direct overlooking of rooms in neighbouring properties, nor excessive amounts of overlooking of garden areas.

(ii) ***Daylight***
Any proposal should not reduce the daylight to neighbouring properties to an unacceptable extent.

(iii) ***Outlook***
The fact that a neighbour may be able to see an extension would not in itself make a proposal unacceptable, the outlook of neighbouring properties should not be dominated by the extension since this could be overbearing and oppressive. However, the loss of a distant view would not normally be considered a valid reason for refusing an application.

2.3 The extent to which the above factors are affected will depend on the size and position of the extension, as well as its location and orientation relative to neighbouring properties. Clearly extensions to a large detached house or bungalow on a large plot are far less likely to affect neighbouring properties than ones to small terraced or semi-detached houses or bungalows. In addition a single-storey extension would be less likely to have an adverse effect on neighbouring properties than a two-storey extension, which would be more likely to reduce daylight to neighbouring properties and lead to problems of overlooking.

THE EFFECT ON THE DWELLING TO BE EXTENDED

(b) ***Garden Size***
The Council will wish to ensure that any proposal does not result in an overdevelopment of the site. An adequate amount of garden should therefore be retained both for the use of the occupiers of the property and to prevent a cramped appearance. A rear garden of 11m depth should be retained. The area of garden required will depend on the size of the property and the Council's requirements are summarised in the Appendix.
(c) ***Daylight/Outlook***
It is not essential for every room to have an outlook and good natural daylighting. However, the Council will wish to ensure that the daylight to and outlook from the principal windows of existing habitable rooms is not unacceptably reduced and that it is adequate for proposed habitable rooms. Habitable rooms will be taken to include living rooms, dining rooms, bedrooms and kitchens (but not small kitchenettes).

THE APPEARANCE

The most important basic principle is that any extension should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and street scene generally. In particular, the proposal should not be allowed to over-dominate the house or clash with its appearance.

2.6 The following principles should also help to ensure that the criteria discussed above are met:-
(a) Extensions should respect the architectural period and style of the existing dwelling and the area.
(b) External construction materials should match in colour and texture the materials of the existing dwelling;
(c) Windows and other openings should be in scale with the extension and should be in line with and match the proportions and style of existing windows.
(d) On a dwelling with a pitched roof, extensions should also have a pitched (or lean-to) roof if they are visible from the street, from a public place, or are two-storey extensions;

3.0 ***STANDARDS FOR EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS***

3.1 The basic principles described in Section 2 should be applied to any type of extension.

From experience of using these principles the Council has developed a number of specific standards, which can be applied to different types of extension. The following

standards should, if adhered to, help you to avoid a number of potential problems. However, as each application must be considered on its own particular merits, compliance cannot in itself guarantee that planning permission will be granted. Any dimensions given represent minimum standards, for example, in some circumstances the character of an area may be such as to require more spacious standards. It is advisable to consider at the outset the full extent of any extensions required, since the cumulative effect of subsequent additions may lack cohesion and be out of scale with the original dwelling and are therefore unlikely to be considered favourably.

II. ***SIDE EXTENSIONS***

3.7 Side extensions should be set back at least 1m from the side boundary. This is particularly important in the case of two-storey extensions since, if adjacent dwellings were both extended up to the side boundary, it would create a "terracing" effect which would destroy the existing character of the area. If the area is spacious in layout and the buildings are large, a space greater than 1m may well be necessary to avoid an appearance of overdevelopment and a cramped effect. There can also be problems of loss of daylight to adjoining properties.
3.8 Side extensions being clearly visible from the road should be designed to closely match the existing dwelling. In particular they should have a roof in keeping with the existing dwelling which, in most cases, will mean a pitched roof. False mono-pitched facades are not acceptable on the front elevation only, they may occasionally be acceptable if they run around all sides of the extension. The extension should usually be set back slightly from the main front wall of the dwelling to create a visual break and ensure the extension is subordinate to the main dwelling and to avoid difficulty in matching wall and roof materials. Very wide side extensions should normally be avoided since they would usually be out of scale with the existing dwelling and spoil its proportions.
3.9 The criteria relating to principal windows (and in some circumstances the retention of rear gardens), described under 3.4 and 3.5 above in relation to rear extensions should also be applied in the case of side extensions.

DORMERS AND ROOF EXTENSIONS

3.11 Dormers should not be so large that they over-dominate the dwelling, resulting in a top heavy 'box-like' appearance. They should be kept well below the ridge level of the existing roof and should not project as far as the walls of the house. A large amount of the original roof should still be clearly visible. Dormers should not "wrap-around" more than one face of a roof and should not normally be located on the side of a hipped roof. The appearance of roof lights will often be more acceptable. Where the existing roof space is of inadequate size to accommodate the room(s) proposed without adding very large flat roofed dormers, permission will not normally be granted.
3.12 The windows in dormers should be similar in style and proportion to those on the original dwelling.
3.13 Where dwellings are less than 22m from principal windows of dwellings to the rear, dormers are unlikely to be acceptable as they would cause an excessive degree of overlooking. This is particularly so in areas characterised by bungalows where no overlooking exists at present.

3.14 Roof extensions should respect the scale, character and appearance of existing dwellings. The cumulative effect of a combined roof extension and dormers is unlikely to be acceptable since the resulting works would probably be out of scale and proportion with the original dwelling.
3.16 Front extensions are particularly difficult to incorporate successfully with the existing house and streetscene. They should not usually extend significantly beyond the "building line", or abut side boundaries. For this reason, front extensions on terraced properties (other than small porches) will not usually be allowed. In the case of semi-detached or detached dwellings, front extensions will only be allowed where the extension can be successfully assimilated into the streetscene and not unduly affect neighbours. Windows in side elevations of front extensions, which are close to and overlook neighbouring properties, will not usually be allowed.'

This is consistent with the **National Planning Policy Framework** which states;

56. The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.

57. It is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes.

58. Local and neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Such policies should be based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics. Planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments:

●●will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;

●●establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit;
●●optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses (including incorporation of green and other public space as part of developments) and support local facilities and transport networks;
●●respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation;
●●create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; and
●●are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

60. Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or

initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

61. Although visual appearance and the architecture of individual buildings are very important factors, securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations. Therefore, planning policies and decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment.

64. Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Impact on Neighbours

In addition to the relevant parts of *Saved policy AH7,* The National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance states inter alia in para 17 ;

17. Within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land-use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. These 12 principles are that planning should:

●always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings;

The proposed side extension and dormer roof extension are well removed from the semi-detached neighbour at 16 and so will have little impact.

The side extension runs very close to the side boundary with 7 Edwin Close, to within 900mm of their rear garden boundary. The rear wall of 7 Edwin Close lines through with the original front wall of the application site and is only 4 metres off the shared boundary. It is considered that the proposed side extension, with fully gabled side wall rear dormer extension and forward projecting front gable feature will create a long side wall in close proximity to the boundary with 7 Edwin Close which will have an oppressive and overbearing impact and will also dominate outlook from the kitchen/ diner at the rear of No. 7 and their garden. Proposed side windows would need to be obscurely glazed and possibly fixed shut to avoid a loss of privacy or other intrusion. As such it is in direct conflict with saved Local Plan policy AH7.

3 occupiers in Western Road North, to the rear, have objected to the application on the grounds of overlooking from the proposed rear dormer. The application site is on considerably higher ground than the properties to the rear and both properties have short rear gardens. Back to back these houses are less than 15 metres apart. Given the short distance apart and the higher ground level at the application site the proposed dormer would be imposing and would dominate outlook from the houses and gardens behind. It would also directly overlook these neighbours unless obscure glazing was used. The applicant has stated he would be prepared to use obscure glazing but this would then give the occupier no outlook. Fixing the window shut would also result in no

direct means of escape from this room. Para 3.13 of 'adopted Adur SPG Development Control Standard No. 3 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' states:

'Where dwellings are less than 22m from principal windows of dwellings to the rear, dormers are unlikely to be acceptable as they would cause an excessive degree of overlooking. This is particularly so in areas characterised by bungalows where no overlooking exists at present.'

The existing bungalow has large rear roof lights and a direct view into the houses and gardens behind is already available from the site. It would also be possible to extend the existing roofspace under Permitted Development. However, the proposed dormer is in a planned side extension and forms part of the same set of building operations and so could not be achieved under PD. It will increase the amount of overlooking, and the perception of overlooking, to occupiers of bungalows behind to the detriment of their living conditions.

Design/Streetscene

The extension is proposed forward of the main front wall by 700mm and to be gabled to reflect the gable on the adjoining property. Extending the house to the side in such a prominent way would unbalance this modest pair of bungalows and would give the bungalow a cramped appearance in its plot- ie its setting.

The high hedging that surrounds the frontage at present cannot be relied upon to screen the development in the future.

A more modest side extension, set back from the front of the property and single storey only was discussed with the applicant but dismissed by him.

Although much reduced, the rear garden retained would still be larger than others in the street.

Recommendation REFUSE for the following reason:

The proposed extensions by virtue of their design, size and position would result in an unneighbourly development which would be harmful to neighbours' living conditions due to loss of outlook, overbearing impact and overlooking and also the side extension's design, scale and position would be harmful to the balanced appearance, character and setting of this pair of bungalows and the wider streetscene The proposal is therefore contrary to saved Adur local plan policies AG1, AH2, and AH7 and Appendix 11 including Supplementary Planning Guidance comprising 'Development Control Standard No. 3 - Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings', emerging Adur local plan Policies 1, 2 and 15 and The National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Informative

1. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or

not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority is willing to meet with the Applicant to discuss the best course of action and is also willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 22.11.16
Authorised and signed by:	PD	Date: 22.11.16