Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0444/17 **Recommendation – Approve**

Site: **8 Collingwood Court**

Proposal: **Two-storey side extension with first floor front balcony, and single-storey rear extension.**

Date of site visit: 12-4-17
Neighbours checked: Y
Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse with single storey garage at the side. The surrounding area is an outer residential suburb of Shoreham, close to the beach.

The proposal is for an L-shaped extension (single storey at rear and two-storey at the side) with front balcony measuring (approx.) 7 metres in height, 10 metres in length, 9.2 metres in width, and infill of ground floor front entrance.

The plans have been amended since the original submission to remove a first floor front extension which a neighbour had objected to.

Relevant site history
None

Consultations
None

Representations
Original Plan: Objections received from occupiers of No. 7 Collingwood Court (and nephew and niece) and No. 2 Flag Square: *Write again on behalf and with the permission of my elderly aunt. Although plans altered slightly there remains the bathroom extension. Concerned plans show this extension has no overhang to take away rain water which from the plans would seem to flow onto her porch. This would of course be unacceptable. No changes to plans which continue to imply that the wall on which bathroom extension would be built is a proper party wall; this is not the case. Whilst this may not be a rationale for refusing these plans they remain inaccurate and deceptive. Additionally despite the new recessed area on the side extension it would alter the whole facade of the house and be out of balance with whole row from 1-8. Caused an elderly woman great distress and I am concerned for her health. She will however be writing on her own behalf when she receives her letter which to date has not been delivered. Drawings supplied imply existing porch structure is integral to the structure of the house but it must be made clear that previous alteration to this part of the structure was the incorporation of a solid pre-existing garden wall used to the front porches. It was an area formerly for bin storage facilities and access to mains drainage manhole*

covers. It is not a continuous structure as implied by the drawings. Drawing also show the use of the whole wall structure by the applicant and this is therefore wrong since the boundary must be the centre-line and there can be no overhang of this by any wall covering, fascia or verge tiles. Furthermore, the addition of the extension will impinge on my Aunt's property as any rainwater run-off from the new wall will be onto the roof porch and there is no suggestion for any allowance for drainage of this. Will adversely affect my Aunt's property as it will her bathroom feel as though it is at the end of a tunnel and reduce light to this space. Also, it will darken the porch area which receives its light from an lantern style roof window. Keen to re-iterate the change to the front adversely changes the whole architectural design of the street. Effectively turn this pair of semi-detached houses into a terrace. Niece and nephew have both made separate objections to first plans and to these plans also. It is clear there is one shard drainpipe and this does not appear in the application. Encouraged me to write to you myself. Should like to point out I am only aware of new plans through emails they received as have not received any communication from your planning department. Lived here very happily for many years and good terms with all my neighbours but this made me very upset and scared as I don't want to change this. I have no worries about the side and rear extensions as they seem very sensible for the family; it is, however the building of the bathroom, which worries me. It will take all the light from my porch and will make my house look like a little annexe to number 8. The extension will look heavy and out of place making the whole row from 1-8 out of order. Other objections which my niece and nephew have point out to me on the plans. There is no proper party wall from the front doors as this wall was a garden type wall built to house the dustbins. There is a drain in the vicinity and unsure if digging footings there will disturb drainage to my home. Writing on behalf of my elderly aunt. Published application confused, inaccurate and does seem to constitute a clear and concise description of the applicant's intentions. This must surely be addressed before any further consideration given. Firstly, drawings are wrong and don't show the property as it exists today. Misleading. Secondly, additional works to front elevation. Include work over front porch and you should be aware that these porches were constructed by using an existing outside garden wall structure between 2 properties. Was an area formerly for bin storage facilities and access to mains drainage manhole covers. Change to front elevation by addition of a room over porch area adversely changes the whole architectural design of the street, is not in keeping with them and unbalances originally approved design. Unclear how following affects planning consent but currently there has been no approach by applicant with regard to development to front of building and neither has anything been said regarding a party wall agreement to allow construction of extension above front porch area, nor to requirement to underpin existing wall described above and allowing an overhang of edge tiles and fascia over my Aunt's property. Please be aware that any agreement to allow such works would not be forthcoming. We would like recorded that the application form and letter informing of application make no mention of the extension to the front bathroom adjacent to her property; the plans however are quite different. Had she only read the letter The front aspect of the pair of houses will be radically changed by the extensions. Plans are not accurate as they do not show the present front door as setback but more importantly do not show the balconies which both houses, and indeed the whole row from 1-8, have. Should extend to front by built and the balcony disappear, there will be no balance left to the appearance of the pair and rest

of the area. Further to this the bathroom will seriously impinge on her bathroom. At present both bathrooms are set back as are the front doors. By extending the bathroom to no. 8 there would be a loss of light to her bathroom, the front door and her hallway. This will also have the effect of making entrance appear to be a 'tunnel'. While the Council cannot take into account loss of value, she is concerned that by the extension of the bathroom her house will appear to be an annexe to no. 8. This will cause her distress as she feels the natural ambience and balance of here property will be taken away. Inaccuracies on the plans meant it was difficult to make any objective decision. Did gleam enough information regarding back elevation being in line with the existing back elevation. This would be intrusive to my property, cut out light and existing views of the South Downs. If this two-storey side extension was in line with the existing garage (not shown) i.e. recessed back from the back elevation it would be more acceptable. Please notify me when these mistakes on the plans have been corrected.

Relevant Planning Policies
National Planning Policy Framework
Adur District Local Plan saved policies: AG1, AH2, AH7
Adur District Local Plan Submission Policies: 2, 15, 23

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle. The side extension would form an integrated annex for a relative. It is necessary this is used incidental to the main house - if used as a separate dwelling it would be unacceptable overdevelopment of the site, contrary to Saved Policy AH2. This outcome can be avoided by the imposing of a planning condition.

Visual amenity

No. 8 forms part of a building group that has already lost its symmetry and balance due to No. 4 having been extended at the side at two-storey. There is no set back to the extension at No.4 and its roof form and shape would closely resemble the proposal at No. 8. No.4's extension is narrower, but this reflects its position between buildings - there is no need for similar spacing to be retained at the side of No. 8 due to the wide pedestrian footway alongside. For these reasons, the L-shaped extension would be sufficiently subservient.

New fenestration would be in the style and design of the existing. Exterior materials/finishes would match. The infilling of the ground floor front entrance would have the appearance of bringing forward the front door so it is flush rather than recessed. This minor change would not materially unbalance the pair (or wider building group).

The submitted drawings lack detail on the final design of the balustrade of the front balcony and it is important to know this to ensure its design would be in keeping with the rest of the building group, so this can be reserved by condition.

Residential amenity

The neighbours principally impacted upon are those at the rear and those physically adjoining (it is physically removed from the remainder, including by way of overlooking across the public street).

At rear

Whilst the extension would curtail this neighbour's outlook to an extent, it would be sufficiently distant to negate adverse overshadowing and overbearing. The first floor rear window would serve a kitchen but is to be obscured, so unacceptable overlooking and intrusive loss of privacy would not occur. Ground floor glazing would be screened by existing boundary treatment.

Adjoining to west

The development would be physically removed from the rear of the neighbouring buildings along Benbow Close to negate adverse overbearing/overshadowing. No first floor windows are proposed in the extension side so overlooking onto these neighbours would be oblique in nature - intrusive views would not result.

Adjoining to east

The protrusion of the single storey rear extension would be marginal, and would not result in adverse overbearing/overshadowing. The absence of windows/openings in the side would negate unacceptable overlooking/loss of privacy.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved plans
2. Exterior materials/finishes to match
3. No use of balcony until and unless details of balustrade agreed by the Local Planning Authority. Shall be built out in accordance
4. Notwithstanding PD no windows/openings at first floor in either side elevation
5. First floor rear kitchen be obscured glazed
6. Accommodation ancillary

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in

favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

Case Officer: Matthew Porter Date: 26-07-2017

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 26 July 2017