Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – Refuse**
AWDM/0391/16

Site: **11 Howard Road, Sompting**

Proposal: **Rooms in roof including increasing height of existing ridge and front and rear dormers. Two-storey side extension with side gable to roof to east elevation and single-storey extension to north elevation following partial demolition of existing detached garage. (Amended re-submission of AWDM/1029/15).**

Date of site visit: 25 April 2016

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site comprises a semi-detached bungalow located on the north side of Howard Road. This is a predominantly residential area comprising of mainly similar bungalows in the immediate vicinity. The street level slopes up from east to west with No.11 set at a lower ground level to the adjoining bungalow.

Permission was granted in 2015 for a hip to gable extension with an increase in the ridge height, front and rear dormers, and a single storey rear and side extension (AWDM/1029/15 refers). The current application would increase the ridge height as previously approved (by approximately 0.45m to align with the ridge of the adjoining bungalow) and follow the same footprint of the previously approved 3 to 4 metre deep (staggered) rear extension and 1.5 metre wide side extension wrapping around the east and north elevations but, in addition to the approved scheme, would extend the side wall of the proposed extension up to form a gable and with first floor accommodation within this additional roofspace. Two front dormer windows are now proposed (one was approved previously) and a wider rear dormer extension is proposed, to extend further to the side, across the extended roof, and would measure 6.5 metres in width.

Relevant site history
As above

Consultations
Southern Water has requested that an informative be attached to any approval advising the applicant of the need to formally apply for a connection to the public sewerage system and have provided advice in relation to sewers.

Representations
Sompting Parish Council – no objection

Two representations received from the occupiers of the immediate neighbouring bungalows to the north and south raising objections on the following grounds:

- Design
- Overdevelopment
- Loss of privacy
- Loss of light/overshadowing
- Noise
- Length of time for building work/monitoring

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' National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Visual amenity
As was the case with the previous application, the raising of the ridge would bring the roofline to that of the adjoining bungalow. Generally roof heights in this locality step down as the ground level slopes down but in the vicinity of the site there are some detached bungalows and so there is no step in level at these properties, and there are other examples of semi-detached bungalows where, because of the size and positioning of dormer extensions, the step in ridgeline is not readily visible. Consequently, the loss of the step in ridge level with the adjoining bungalow is not considered to cause significant harm to visual amenity and the ridgeline of the bungalow to the east would still be lower than as proposed at No.11. There are various other dormer windows visible in the streetscene and the two front dormer windows proposed are not in themselves particularly large compared with others visible in the streetscene. The rear dormer, although wider that the original application, would retain a similar spacing to each side as previously approved and given the scale of other roof extensions in the vicinity, would not cause significant visual harm. A side gable extension was proposed previously but the extension of this over the side extension would close some of the spacing with the neighbouring bungalow to the east which would not be ideal, appearing more cramped in relation to No.9. Whilst there is some variation in the streetscene, in terms of the space between bungalows this would result in a particularly narrow (2 metre wide) separation distance between the two side gables. Where a similar or narrower spacing is present in the streetscene this is generally where there are single storey side additions in close proximity, whereas the main side walls of neighbouring bungalows are generally separated by at least a driveways width. However, the perception in the streetscene is of no regular pattern of separation and so a refusal on these grounds alone would not be justified.

Residential amenity
The rear extension would follow the same footprint as the approved scheme measuring 3 metres in depth on the adjoining neighbour's side and having a

staggered rear elevation, with the deeper 4 metre deep section on the other side and so the immediate impact on the adjoining occupier at No.15 to the west has not altered significantly. However the previous east side extension was proposed to be single storey which allowed the 'wrap around' design to be hipped away from the neighbouring bungalow at No.9 which sits at the lower ground level (approximately 0.5m lower). The current proposal would result in a new side gable wall along the full depth of the main bungalow and rear extension with a separation distance of approximately 2 metres between the side gable of No.9 and the proposed side wall. No.9 has a rear extension approximately 5 metres in depth with outlook to the rear but with main side windows serving the kitchen area and a secondary side window serving the rear living space. The elevation details show side windows (although not shown on the floor plans) which could be obscure glazed to avoid overlooking. Whilst the separation distance was previously considered acceptable with a single storey proposal, with the roof hipped and pitching away from No.9, the concerns raised in the representation from the occupier of No.9 are noted and it is considered that the effect of the proposed side wall in close proximity to the neighbouring dwelling would be overbearing, particularly given the change in level between the two dwellings, significantly increasing the sense of enclosure and resulting in a loss of outlook for the neighbouring occupiers of No.9. The proposed extension is therefore considered to be unneighbourly and detrimental to the amenities of No.9

Recommendation

REFUSE

For the following reasons:

The proposed rear and side gabled extension would, by reason of its design, size, and proximity to the neighbouring dwelling to the east, represent an unneighbourly and overbearing form of development, harmful to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, notably in terms of an increased sense of enclosure. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved policies AG1 and AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan, supplementary planning guidance in Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' and the relevant policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative:

- Proactive statement
- Drawings

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

Case Officer: Rebekah Smith Date: 9 May 2016

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 10 May 2016