Expiry Date - 15/03/2012

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0087/12 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: **7 The Marlinespike Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5RD**

Proposal: **Front dormer with pitched roof, and west side balcony extension over existing living room (rear dormer extension to be built as 'permitted development')**

Date of site visit: 20.01.12

Neighbours checked: Y

Proposal

The application dwelling is a detached 'chalet' style 1950's bungalow located on the south side of the road, of brick built and concrete tile construction. The dwelling has a single-storey, front projection with gabled roof to the east, and a flat roofed single-storey rear extension, with a gabled rear projection to the west. The flat roof of the east side rear extension is utilised as a first floor balcony accessed from a rear flat-roofed dormer.

The applicant has undertaken the replacement of the existing rear gabled roof, to allow the extension of the existing rear dormer across to the west side of the roof. This operation is being undertaken under permitted development.

Permission is sought for the extension of the balcony across the remainder of the ground floor extensions, which would now have a matching parapet roof design, proposed new balustrade, and 1.7m high obscurely glazed west side screen. Additionally the application is for a pitch roofed front dormer.

The surrounding dwellings in the vicinity are of similar age, with there being primarily detached and semi-detached bungalows, with a number of modest sized flat-roofed dormers.

Relevant site history
SU/0369/88/BR – Rooms in roof.
SU/51/96/TP – Single-storey rear extension with balcony. Approved 25.05.96.

Representations

Third Parties: There have been two letters of objection to the proposals from the owners of No's 35 & 37 East Meadway located to the SW of the site. The owner of No.37 states that their objection concerns the balcony extension. Builders currently erecting the dormer window have a direct view into the rear bedrooms of their property and so users of the balcony would

have the same view. The balcony will directly overlook a decked area at the end of their garden which is used for seating and as a BBQ area.
The owners of No.35 feel that the proposed balcony will intrude greatly on their privacy. The doors and windows they have installed along with the balcony will effect their privacy both in the lounge and in their garden which they use daily in the summer. They feel that they will need to draw curtains to retain their privacy in the evenings, which currently they do not have to do. They feel that the noise of people on the balcony will intrude on their space. They also feel that the existing balcony was never approved as one and has never used as one until very recently.

Relevant Planning Policies
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

Visual amenity
The proposed front dormer is relatively modest in scale, with the side cheeks being no wider than necessary. This results in the dormer having a mass that is not much more than the size of the proposed window, which is the same as the window at ground floor level, and similar in width to other front dormers in the locality. The proposed pitched roof would be a different design to those front dormers already permitted, however given the mix of dwelling types and different sizes of front dormers it is felt that, on balance, the front dormer would not be unduly out of character so that it would result in an adverse impact on the streetscene as a whole.

Residential amenity
The main concern with the proposals would be whether the extended balcony would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to the adjacent properties through excessive overlooking. The dwelling is currently served by a balcony on the east side of the rear of the dwelling, accessed from the existing rear dormer. This was approved in 1996. It has a 1m high timber balustrade which allows for extensive views in all directions. Being located on the eastern side however the views are slightly restricted towards the west. The neighbour on this side (No.9) has a rear extension with east side patio door, and from the balcony extension there would be direct views into this room. The applicant proposed to erect an obscurely glazed screen up to 1.7m in height along the whole side of the balcony, and it is considered that this would protect the existing levels of privacy to this neighbour.

The neighbour to the east (No.5) is already overlooked from the existing balcony, as no screening is in place, and it was not a requirement of the former planning permission. The neighbours are in the process of implementing their own permission for a similar balcony, and will have

screening on the west side. It is not thought that the proposals if granted permission would lead to extra overlooking or loss of privacy to the east.

The occupants of the dwellings to the SW are aligned at an angle of 90 degrees from the site. No.37 the most northern of the two is sited 27m from the closest part of the balcony, whereas No.35 is sited closer to the rear boundary, but is also 27m away. Views from the extended section of the balcony would be oblique towards the rear rooms of these dwellings. No.35 has a large catslide rear roof, and only has rear facing rooms at ground floor level. An arbour with growing vine aids the screening of the rear rooms to a degree. No. 37 is a house and does have first floor windows, some screening is present in the form of a pitched roof garage at the rear of No.8 The Marlinespike, and again there is an arbour adjacent to the northern boundary which aids screening of the ground floor windows, to a degree.

The applicant proposes to screen the west side of the balcony extension, which with the separation between it and the rear facing windows, and the oblique angle, is considered to be sufficient to prevent any loss of privacy to the rooms of the adjacent houses.

With regards to the loss of privacy to the rear gardens of the properties. It is considered that a precedent has been set with the approved balcony which has been installed in compliance with the former approval. The existing balcony is to the east side of the dwelling, and is deeper at 2.8m than the proposed balcony extension (2m). The existing balcony area, has views over the rear gardens of the adjacent properties particularly over the boundary fence at the rear of No.37's decked area, which is approximately 15m away. The closest part of the new balcony would be 13m away. Whilst the view may be more of a direct angle to this part of the garden, it is not considered that the additional overlooking from the extended area of balcony, would result in a loss of privacy that would be significantly worse than the level that currently exists from the approved balcony area.

Recommendation

The west side balcony extension would allow for more overlooking of the adjacent garden areas but would be screened from direct views of neighbouring windows to the west, however in light of the existing balcony, it is not considered that this would result in a loss of privacy which would be significantly different from what currently exists. The proposed front dormer window would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of the neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7).

Subject to:

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Materials of front dormer to match existing dwelling

3. An obscure glazed screen 1.7m in height above floor level of the balcony and 2.2m in depth shall be erected on the western side of the balcony prior to commencement of use of the enlarged part of the balcony and shall thereafter be retained.
4. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Drawing No: 1:1250 Site Location Plan. Date Received: 19.01.12
   Drawing No: 212/433/6 Date Received: 19.01.12
   Drawing No: 212/433/3 Date Received: 19.01.12
   Drawing No: 212/433/5 Date Received: 19.01.12
   Drawing No: 212/433/4 Date Received: 19.01.12

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

Case Officer: C. Hone Date: 09.03.12.

Authorised by: Keith Morgan Date: 16 March 2012