Expiry Date – 13/9, EOT 21/10

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1313/21 Recommendation – Grant

Site: **39 Kingston Lane, Southwick**

Proposal: **Raising of the roof ridge and eaves to form rooms in roof with side (north) dormer and rooflight to both sides; single storey rear extension; first floor front extension over existing bay**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 21/9 and 1/10

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a bungalow on the east side of Kingston Lane. The bungalow sits between two, 2-storey houses and has a flat roofed garage on its southern boundary. It is a rendered and white painted bungalow under a dual pitched tiled roof with a front bay detail. It has been extended at the rear with a flat roofed extension.

The property has recently built a detached annex in the rear garden, with planning permission.

The property is not in a conservation area and is not listed.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought to add a first floor to this bungalow following the footplate of the original house, its general roof form and extending the front bay upwards. The increase in eaves and ridge height is 1.5 metres. A single storey rear extension is also proposed in place of the existing one to a depth of 4 metres and a north side dormer for staircase access. The existing garage is unaffected.

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/2140/21 - Detached self-contained annex in rear garden for relative. Granted 4.3.21

Consultations

None.

Representations

Objection received from No.41, to the south, summarized as follows:

1. Loss of light to bedrooms
2. Impact on mental health
3. Reliance on artificial light, consequent wear and tear on appliances
4. Loss of view of the Downs
5. Overlooking of garden
6. Rooflights on south side will look into side windows and bedrooms.
7. Noise and disturbance during build to occupants who work shifts
8. Scaffolding on site will prevent windows being opened.
9. Overdevelopment of plot will devalue neighbouring houses.
10. Garage on boundary if damaged will damage No. 41 also
11. Drawings show an inconsistency as height on southern side is less than shown on other 3 elevations. Is this correct?
12. Are the rooflights positioned correctly on the roofplan and elevations?

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2021
Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and 15 including 'Development Management Standard No. 2 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development can be supported as it upgrades a dwelling within the built up area boundary. For consideration is the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area and the impacts of the development on neighbour amenity.

Character

Houses either side are two storeys as are those opposite, these are of different designs to each other. The east side of the street has a more mixed vernacular including bungalows. The proposal is to lift the eaves and ridge height by 1.5 metres whilst maintaining the aesthetic of the hipped roof. The eaves and ridge lines will still be below both neighbours.

This development will not be out of keeping generally.

Neighbour amenity

The flank wall of No. 41, to the south, is on the shared boundary. The site's garage is also on this boundary. No. 41 has a 4.5 metre deep single storey rear extension. The proposed first floor extension will project slightly, less than 1 metre, beyond the main rear wall of No. 41 but to the north and at a separation distance of 2.7 metres. Windows

in the first floor side wall of No 41 are a landing window and a secondary bedroom window.

The ground floor extension is 4 metres deep and will extend approximately 750mm beyond the line of the conservatory to be demolished. It will have a similar rear wall to the rear extension at 41.

No significant loss of light or outlook will occur to No. 41. Loss of a view or harm to property values are not planning considerations. Nor is the potential for the build to cause damage to adjoining properties. This is a civil matter between neighbours.

No. 37, to the north, has a recessed first floor approximately 3 metres behind the two storey rear wall proposed. These properties are separated by paired shared passages, approximately 2.5 metres in total width. In 37's main rear wall is a dining room window and bedroom window east facing. Given the degree of separation and the hipped roof proposed significant loss of light will not occur to the dining room and little at all loss will be felt in the bedroom. Nor will the extension be overbearing. In No. 37's deeper outrigger facing the site and further from the boundary is a secondary kitchen window and door and first floor bathroom window. These will be little affected. The owners of No. 37 do not object to the application.

No first floor side flank windows are proposed. An additional ground floor south side window is proposed which will look towards the solid ground floor flank of 41. Fewer windows are proposed in the ground floor north side wall.

Front building lines are very slightly staggered with the front wall at site slightly in front of 41 but behind 37 marginally.

Overlooking of rear gardens from the first floor windows proposed will occur but this is no different to the situation for other two storey neighbours. The north side dormer window is to a staircase. The rooflights proposed are positioned with a cill level more than 1.7 m off finished floor to prevent direct overlooking. This is conditioned and no additional rooflights or first floor windows are permitted and this is also controlled by condition.

Recommendation APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. *Approved Plans*
2. *3 years*
3. *Matching materials*
4. *Rooflights cill height minimum 1.7m off finished floor level*
5. *No new side windows first floor/roof*
6. *Obscure glaze landing window*
7. *Hours of construction*

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? Yes.

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 19/10/21
Authorised and signed by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 19 October 2021