Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0234/17 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 2 Berriedale Drive, Sompting, Lancing

Proposal: Hip to gable roof extension to south, front and rear dormers and roof lights, single storey rear extension.

Date of site visit: 4.04.17

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposals

The application relates to a semi-detached, hipped roof bungalow. The building is the southern-most bungalow on the east side of the road. The properties abutting the dwelling to the south are nos. 54 -60 Cokeham Road. Their rear boundaries border the southern elevation of the site, no. 60 abuts the dwelling itself. The bungalow has an attached, flat roof garage, carport structure to the southern side which is adjacent to a garage building to the south at no. 60. The bungalow has a rear flat roof addition with side utility and rear conservatory to the rear of the extension.

The bungalow has a large rear garden and a garage/store/outbuilding has recently been constructed by the applicants adjacent to the southern boundary. There is a shed to the rear, eastern boundary.

The applicants have recently purchased this bungalow with a view to realise its development potential for their particular, unique, requirements.

The applicants' daughter, following a recent accident is now severely disabled and not able to live with the family currently due to the facilities and space required for her day-to-day needs. The proposals here are required to provide the family with suitable space for their needs as a family and for their daughter. The space required at ground floor will provide a family living room, nurses bedroom (for 24 hour care) bathroom, utility, kitchen, living, bedroom and wet room for their daughter. The first floor space will provide two bedrooms and two shower rooms for the applicants and their son. The proposals also include a side car port which will provide covered space for entrance to and from the property in a purpose built vehicle.

The extensions to the bungalow include a single storey flat roof addition. The existing flat roof addition and conservatory are to be removed and an extension 8 metres beyond the original rear wall is proposed. This extension is to be slightly wider than the original main building, 1.8 metres beyond the side wall of bungalow. It is of flat roof design, 3.1 metres in height.

A hip to gable extension is proposed which also includes extending the roof of the bungalow to the south over the proposed side extension, an additional 2.2 metres. Front and rear flat roof dormers are proposed. The rear dormer is 10.2 metres wide, 2.3 metres high with a maximum depth of 3 metres. The front dormer is 4.5 metres wide, 1.6 metres high, with a maximum depth of 2.5 metres. The car port to the side is 3 metres wide.

Sompting Parish Council: - Support

Representations: 1 letter of representation from the owner/occupier of no. 60 Cokeham Road Sompting. “I have no objection to the planning application for 2 Berriedale Drive.”

Consultations: - In my opinion the proposed Cantilever Foundation will reduce disruption to the RPA of the hedge, and minimise any damage to the existing plants. I can therefore confirm that I consider this a adequate solution.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
Local Plan Submission (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 needs of the applicants and their family have been clearly set out within the application. Details of the equipment that is needed for their daughter to carry out necessary day to day functions has been provided and this and her needs require space and a suitable layout. The special needs and requirements of the family is a material consideration, especially as the bungalow without adaptation cannot meet those needs or provide a home for the family member until modified and extended.

Based on the supporting information officers do not consider that the proposed additions both to ground and first floor are not necessary requirements here. It is not considered that any reduction in floor space could be made here.

The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality however this is to be balanced with the needs of the applicant as stated above.

Visual Amenity

The scale and proportions of the existing modest hipped-roof bungalow will be significantly altered as a result of the proposals.

Although large in size the replacement single-storey rear addition can be satisfactorily accommodated within the generous rear garden without appearing over-developed. The flat-roofed form will minimise its visual impact and is similar in design to many other rear additions to the properties in this road.

The elongated roof with hip-to-gable will be significantly different in appearance to the existing hipped roof and will disrupt the symmetry of the existing pair. However, a number of other properties in this road have undertaken hip-to-gable roof extensions (many as 'permitted development'). Consequently it would be difficult to argue that the enlarged and altered roof form would be a discordant or unsympathetic feature in the street.

Although there are other examples of front dormers in the road, these tend to be relatively modest in width. At over 4m wide the proposed front dormer would be wider than most, but seen in the context of the elongated roof it would not appear as an overly dominant feature. Although the siting of the front dormer is poorly related to the existing ground-floor features of the bungalow, it is centrally positioned on the front roof slope dormer which creates some sense of visual balance.

The rear dormer is extremely wide but for the most part its large bulk will not be visible within the street-scene other than its southern extremity. Views from the south will be partly screened by the forward position and 'bulk' of the double garage in the rear of the neighbouring plot (No.60).

Residential Amenity

Due to the position of the bungalow in the street there is a significant distance between the proposed extensions and the dwellings to the south in Cokeham Road. The rear north-facing elevation of No. 60 is in excess of 15 metres away. Views of the proposed extensions from this property will be partially screened owing to the height and 'bulk' of the above-mentioned garage building. The owner/occupier of this bungalow has submitted representations to say they have no objection. The other properties which border the site to the south in Cokeham Road are at a similar separation distance and although there are views toward the rear of the site and the garden, the proposed extensions and alterations will not be intrusive or overbearing at this distance, nor give rise to any significant loss of light or privacy. Many of these properties have outbuildings in their gardens which will offer further screening.

The main property to be affected in no. 4 Berriedale Drive the adjacent bungalow to the north of the site. This property has an existing flat roof rear addition shown as being 3.5 metres on the submitted floor plan. The proposed extension will extend 4.5 metres beyond this extension. Under normal circumstances an extension of single storey adjacent to the boundary of an attached dwelling would be permitted to extend beyond the wall of the adjacent property by 3.5 metres. This would be supported by the Council's Development Control Standards which support such development as it is considered that this relationship between dwellings would not give rise to any significant loss of light or overbearing impact that would warrant a refusal. The normal requirement here would be for the applicant to reduce the extension by 1 metre to comply with this requirement. However, the applicant has subsequently advised that internal room dimensions as currently proposed are

critical owing to the specialist equipment needed to meet the day-to-day requirements of the occupier, leaving no scope for amendment in this case.

There is a section of conifer hedge adjacent to the boundary within the curtilage of No.4 which if it were to remain would screen the rear part of the extension from view from No.4. The hedge is currently higher than the fence and in effect would negate any benefit in terms of receipt of light that would derive from reducing the depth of the extension by 1 metre. If retained, the existing hedge would also have the benefit of 'softening' the visual impact of the rear extension.

Due to the siting of the proposed extension in relation to the common boundary it was unclear as originally submitted whether the proposed construction in close proximity to the roots of the hedge would be compatible with its retention. The applicant's agent has proposed alterative solutions for the foundations of the extension to try to ensure the survival of the hedge. One approach which has been suggested by the applicant's agent is to have beams cantilevered within the vicinity of the trees to not impact upon their roots. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer supports this approach which can be secured by a condition of planning permission.

The rear dormer although large in scale as mentioned above will overlook the rear garden of the adjacent dwelling, no. 4 yet reducing the dormer would not reduce this impact to any significant degree. It is therefore considered that this relationship is acceptable and is commonplace within built up area such as this.

Conclusion

Although the proposed extensions and alterations will substantially alter the scale and proportions of this modest bungalow they have been designed so as to minimise their impact in public views and can be satisfactorily accommodated within this generous-sized plot.

The single-storey storey rear extension is deeper than would normally be considered acceptable in accordance with the Council's adopted SPG but can be supported in this case owing to the particular need for the development and on the basis that measures will be taken to secure the retention of the existing hedge within the neighbour's curtilage which will mitigate the effects of the extension on the amenities of No.4.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. Time limit
2. Materials to match
3. Approved plans
4. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved drawings the external, finished height of the rear extension shall not exceed 3.1 metres in height.
5. The foundations of the single-storey rear extension hereby permitted shall be constructed using cantilevered beams as shown on the additional floor plan submitted on 27.04.2017. Prior to commencement of any ground works on the

single storey rear extension the exact position of the adjacent trees/hedging shall be surveyed in order to determine the optimum position of the beams to minimise damage to the tree/hedge roots and the exact positioning of the cantilevered beams shall be approved on site following inspection by the LPA prior to the construction proceeding further.
{\b Reason}: {\i To protect the adjacent vegetation at no. 4 Berriedale Drive which protects the residential amenities of the adjacent occupier and accords with Policy AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan.

6. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 as amended (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional windows or other openings shall be formed in north and south side walls of the extensions/roof enlargments.

Informative

1. Proactive no amendments
2. The applicant is advised that the method of using cantilevered beams in construction and final details is subject to Building Control approval.

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 2nd May 2017

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 03.05.2017