EXPIRES 21-12-09

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0413/09 Recommendation - Permit

Site: **81 Old Fort Road Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5HA**

Proposal: **Single-storey pitch-roofed side extension**

The Application

The application relates to a detached two-storey house built in 1919 located on the north side of Old Fort Road. The existing dwelling is a large detached house with a hipped roof, tiled in glazed cobalt-blue roof tiles. To the east side is a two-storey extension which makes up part of the east side boundary with the adjacent bungalow (No. 83). Currently the dwelling has a balcony across the whole front of the dwelling which increases in depth over the front entrance portico.

The proposals are for a single-storey east side extension, abutting the original dwelling and the front of the existing two-storey extension, adjacent to the east side boundary. The extension would be 2.7m in width, by 5.4m in depth, by 3.3m in height.

A previous application for a flat-roofed two-storey east side extension (ADC/0323/09) was recently refused for the reasons that:

1. *The proposed extension, by reason of its large size and unsympathetic design, would be out of keeping in scale and appearance with the existing building and would detract to an unacceptable extent from the visual amenities and residential environment of the locality and thereby conflict with the policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7).*
2. *The proposed extension, by reason of its large size and unneighbourly design and siting, would be detrimental to the residential amenities of the locality, resulting in loss of privacy and an overbearing effect on the adjoining property, contrary to the policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AH7).*

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: There has been one letter received from the adjacent neighbour to the east (No.83), who state that they appreciate that the proposals have been changed from the original one but stheir concerns regarding the proposals are:-

- The plans is not clear enough to see how far from the garden wall the extension will be built, as long as it is not on the existing boundary line.

The only concern is that the window will be directly opposite our own which will result in a loss of privacy.

- On the proposed block plan there is a rectangular item by the entrance but no mention is made of this.
- Still have some concern about footings being disturbed.

[NB: The application description is for a single-storey side extension and for no other alterations or outbuildings, with the block plan now having been amended. The proposed footing are an issue that would usually be covered by a Building Regulations submission and are not considered a planning matter]

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, relation specifically to extensions and alterations to dwellings, states that they should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable loss of light or privacy or have an overbearing effect on the neighbouring dwelling and be sympathetic to the original dwelling. Supplementary Planning Guidance in DC Standard No. 3 'Extensions and Alteration to Dwellings' states that side extensions being clearly visible from the road should be designed to closely match the existing dwelling. In particular they should have a roof in keeping with the existing dwelling which, in most cases will mean a pitched roof.

Visual amenity

Whereas the previous application for a two-storey extension had a very dominant appearance, with no natural break between it and the original house, and a roof form than neither matched the original house or that of the existing two-storey extension to the rear, the current design is far more sympathetic in terms of its design and scale.

The proposals would have a slight set-back from the front elevation of the dwelling, and it has been designed with a matching arched window and hipped roof form that is proposed to match the distinctive blue tiling of the existing dwelling. The existing boundary wall between the site and the neighbouring bungalow is to remain.

Residential amenity
The originally refused application for a two-storey extension would have been sited so that it would continue on from the existing two-storey rear/side extension, directly on the boundary with the neighbour. The resultant high flank wall of the building was considered to be particularly overbearing and unneighbourly in appearance.

The current proposals would be markedly smaller, and given that they would be single-storey and inset from the boundary, allowing for the existing wall to remain it is considered that the impact would be far less severe. The adjacent bungalow has one single window that would face the proposed extension across the existing driveway, and whilst it would bring the mass of the building closer it is not considered that it would be so overbearing as to warrant a refusal in this case.

The extension would serve as an extension to the existing lounge, and would have a window in the east elevation. To protect the privacy of the neighbour it is recommended that this window be obscurely glazed and fixed shut.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPi

Subject to:

1. C1Ci
2. C12Eii
3. C18C3 (east)
4. C14A3 (amended)
   This permission relates to the application as amended by the revised block plan received 19.11.09 and not to the block plan originally submitted.
   Reason: *For ...etc (AH7 of the ADLP)*

20/11

Case Officer
Date: 20.11.09

Planning Services Manager:
Date: 4/12/09

Development Control Committee Chairman:
Date: 07/12/09