expires 08/05/10

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0007/10 Recommendation - Permit

Site: **17 Oxen Avenue Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5AF**

Proposal: **First-floor rear extension and single-storey front extension (porch/WC)**

The Application

The application relates to a detached 1930's hipped roof house, located on the west side of the road within the built-up area of Shoreham. The dwelling is within a site the slopes gradually from the east down to the west, and that is irregular in shape, angling towards the south at the rear of the dwelling.

The proposals are for a front porch incorporating a w.c., and rear first floor extension above the existing flat roof extension (south side). The front porch would be 4m wide, by 1.2m in depth, by 3.3m in height (as amended). The rear extension would be sited on the southern half of the existing rear projection, and would be 3.4m wide, by 3.5m in depth, by 4m in height to the ridge of the hipped roof.

The road is comprised of similar sized detached dwellings on the west, whereas to the east are a number of two-storey blocks of flats. Directly to the north is No.17a a detached house with flat-roofed rear extension which extends the same distance as the extension at the rear of the application site. A 1.8m close boarded fence separates the two dwellings running east to west, with a number of shrubs that are taller on the side of 17a between the gardens. The application site has a tall holly tree between the north side of the rear extension and the boundary.

Consultations and Representations

Third parties: There has been one letter of objection received from the adjacent neighbour to the north (No.17a). They state that the close proximity of 17 and 17a means that natural light is already limited, particularly to their dining room, where artificial light is required during the day. The height of the proposed (rear) extension will shield natural light from the lounge and therefore impact on the dining room. The neighbour also states that a hot tub that has been installed in a private but sunny part of the patio, and was located based on the fact that they could enjoy its use safe in the knowledge that it would not be overlooked. They feel that the rear extension will result in loss of privacy to this part of the garden and cause overshadowing for a large part of the day.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.'
PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies
Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general and accord with the Council's DC standards.

Development Control Standard No.3 entitled 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' states that front extensions are particularly difficult to incorporate successfully with existing the house and streetscene. They should not extend significantly beyond the 'building line', or abut side boundaries. 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.

Visual amenity
The design of the front porch has been amended due to the fact that as originally submitted it would have projected too far in front of the dwelling, would have had no front door facing the road, thus reducing its legibility, and would have resulted in the loss of a car parking space. The amended proposals result in the proposed porch being closer to the main building line as it would only be 1.2m deep, it would have a sympathetic hipped roof, and a front door facing the main road. The proposed porch would now be similar in size to the porch at the front of No.9 (south) therefore it is considered that it would be acceptable in appearance and its effect on the amenity of the area.

The rear extension is considered to be sympathetic in scale and design, it would not be viewed from the road and therefore it too is considered to be acceptable.

Residential amenity - privacy

The proposed rear extension would project from the rear of the dwelling by 3.5m, with the main outlook towards the west over their own garden, and towards the roof of the flat roofed garage of No.17a. There would be oblique views to the north-east and south-west over the neighbouring gardens, however these would be no worse than the overlooking that currently exists, which is commonplace from the rear of the surrounding houses.

With particular reference to the privacy of the neighbours hot tub. The location of the hot tub is in the southernmost part of the garden adjacent to the rear elevation of the building, and adjacent to the high boundary fence and shrubs that separate it from the site. It is clearly overlooked from the rear windows of No's 19 and 21 to the north, and whilst any oblique views from the extension would be from a closer distance (5m), it is not considered that it would lessen the current levels of privacy experienced to the rear garden of 17a.

Dwellings to the west in Northbourne Close are in excess of 30m away and would therefore not be affected by the proposals.

The front porch would not result in loss of privacy, outlook or natural daylight to neighbouring dwellings.

Residential amenity - sunlight

The occupant of No.17a has also objected on the grounds of loss of natural daylight to the lounge at the rear of their dwelling, and consequently the impact that this would have on their dining room which is directly east and open-plan in layout. The objector states that the dining room already suffers from poor natural light levels, and it would appear from daylight indicators that due to the lounge window being to the north of the main two-storey part of the applicants house, that no direct sunlight would enter this room at any part of the day. Any light entering the lounge from the south would have no bearing on the amenity of the dining room.

The neighbours lounge is located within the rear extension of No.17a, and it has a large window in the south elevation, however the principal outlook is to the west towards the garden through full width glazing in the rear elevation. The proposed extension would be due south of the neighbours lounge and would be located approximately 5.5m away. Sunlight indicators for wintertime sun (March) show that the rear extension would have a similar effect on overshadowing the south facing window, as the existing flat-roofed extension (located only 1m from the boundary) currently does. The main outlook of the room is to the west into the rear garden, and this would get natural sunlight for a large part of the afternoon. It is therefore considered that the rear extension would not have an adverse affect on the amount of sunlight available to the rear rooms of No.17a.

Residential amenity – outlook

The proposed rear extension would project to the rear by 3.5m it would be inset from the dwelling to the north, retaining a separation of 5m to the side elevation of the neighbour (17a). To the south (No.15) the separation would be 2.5m, and whilst ordinarily the impact on the ground floor rooms of neighbouring dwellings in such proximity may have their outlook impacted due to the high flank wall, in this case the house to the south has a single-storey extension projecting 3m on the north side, thus the impact of the proposed first-floor extension would be limited.

Recommendation

Approve for the reason that:

1PPi

1. C1Ci
2. C12Eii
3. C18Eiv – …in the north or south wall of the extensions…
4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 02 Rev B proposed elevations and floor plans, date stamped received 16/2/10.
   Reason: *For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.*

Case Officer [redacted] 16/2/10
Date: 16/2/10

Planning Services Manager: [redacted]
Date: 18/2/10

Chair of the Planning Committee [redacted]
Date: 23/02/10