Expires
14-05-08

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0154/08 **Recommendation - Permit**

Site: **53 The Drive Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5GD**

Proposal: **Two-storey rear extension (retrospective)**

The Application

The application property is the northern half of a pair of semi-detached 1930's houses located on the west side of the Drive within the built up area of Shoreham.

The property itself has a cat-slide roof on the northern side of the building with eaves at first floor level. The property had as an original feature to the rear a single storey gabled projection 2.3m in length which housed the ground floor kitchen.

The Drive is made up of a variety of different properties throughout the entirety of the road, however the dominant property type in the vicinity of the application house on the west side of the road is of a similar design with a side cat-slide roof. Most of the properties have extended at the side with a flat-roof dormer, in the case of most under permitted development. No's 21, 23, 25, 31, 33, 39, 41, 57, 59, 63, 65, 67, 69, 71, 73 all have large box side dormers over the cat-slide roof.

Site history

The property has had two previous planning applications refused for rear extensions, to extend the kitchen area and incorporate a bedroom above accessed from the existing roof void at the side of the house.

SU/15/06 was for a proposed two-storey extension 5.9m in length, by 3.9m in width, by 7.1m in height to the ridge of the hipped roof. It was refused on the grounds that:

> *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.*

ADC/0041/06 was for a two-storey proposal with a mansard roof that was reduced in height from SU/15/06, and would have had the same footprint size of 5.9m by 3.9m by a height of 5.3m. It was refused on the grounds that:

> *The proposal would form an obtrusive and incongruous feature that does not relate sympathetically to the design and appearance of the existing dwelling and would be visually out of keeping with the existing surrounding development.*

Following both refusals the applicant's agent amended the scheme to enable a reduced version of ADC/0041/06 to be built under permitted development. Following initial concerns from nearby neighbours it was found that the extension as built exceeded the permitted development allowance of 70 cubic metres and that it had not been built in accordance with the plans submitted under building regulations. The extension as built has been calculated to be 76 cubic metres in volume and therefore requires planning permission.

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

Third Parties: There have been no third party objections to the proposals.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (WSCC 2005): LOC1, DEV1, DEV4-5.
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7, and Appendix II ' Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

Planning Assessment

Policies
Structure Plan policies seek to protect, and where possible, enhance the character and distinctiveness of an area, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). 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.

Visual amenity
The overall character of the area has been permanently changed by the amount of large side dormers that have been built in the vicinity on the same type of house. These are usually built up to the front elevation of the property and appear overdominant for the side roof plane.

The extension can be seen from the road to the east of the property, however it is well set back from the front of the property by 5.5m and a great amount of cat-slide roof is still visible. It is set back behind a tall gate and fence which add to lessening the impact from the street. It is considered that as built the extension does not have a harmful impact on the visual amenity of the streetscene given the amount of large side dormers that already exist, and in no way unbalances the pair of semi-detached houses.

The extension has a flat roof at second storey level which usually is not acceptable, however given the context of the area and particularly the flat roof rear extension and garage of the adjoining sites it would not be particularly out of keeping as seen from the rear gardens. The flat roof extension is clearly two-storey as seen from the rear, however it is not viewed in this context from the front of the property where it has the appearance of a side dormer.

Residential amenity

The extension replaces an original rear projection which had a height of 5.2m to the ridge of the roof and a depth of 2.3m. The extension as built is larger at 4.9m in length and slightly taller at 5.4m, however the angle of the tiled first floor is more vertical that the sloping roof of the original gabled feature.

The relationship between the application property and the neighbour to the north is quite open. The Drive slopes upwards to the north and No.55 is angled away from No.53, due to the change in width of the street outside. No.55 has a large flat roof rear extension (single-storey) with sliding patio doors in the south side opening onto a raised patio area. A minimum distance of 8.0m exists between the extension and the patio doors of No.55. A tree is growing at the boundary between the extension and the patio of No.55 and obscures the view to a certain extent, but this would only be when the tree is in leaf.

The application extension is 2.6m longer that the original rear projection but of a similar height. Due to the angled siting of the property to the north (No.55) and the separation that exists between the two sites, it is considered that the amount of natural daylight would only be marginally reduced. It does not greatly change the outlook from the south side of No.55's extension and due to the separation does not appear overbearing.

The attached property to the south (No.51) has the original gabled rear projection and between it and the boundary a large Victorian style conservatory obscurely glazed to the north, and a replacement, enlarged flat-roof garage which attaches to the side of the house, yet projects 6.0m past the rear of the existing rear projection.

The increased visible mass of the extension is 2.6m longer that the original projection, it is set back from the boundary by a distance of 2.55m and it is considered that the overall bulk of the extension as built would not have an unacceptable effect on the outlook from the rear rooms of the attached property. The obscure glazing and polycarbonate roof of the conservatory prevents any loss of outlook from this room.

The extension is located to the north of the attached property and does not lead to a loss of natural daylight.

The windows in the south and north elevation of the extension at first floor level are both obscurely glazed. The bathroom window is a velux style and covered with adhesive film which obscures the views but nevertheless this could be removed at a later date and result in overlooking of the rear of

No.55. The south facing window serving the bedroom is glazed with obscured glass, however the window is a casement design which allows for the window to be opened, again allowing for overlooking of the neighbouring property from first floor level where previously none existed.

The original rear projection had a small south facing window serving the original kitchen. The extension now has two larger windows in the south serving the enlarged kitchen both of which are clear glazed and have views directly towards the conservatory of No.51. The north side elevation of the conservatory is obscurely glazed and it is felt no loss of privacy occurs as a result of the additional south side fenestration.

The window in the west of the extension has views mainly of the rear garden and leads to no loss of amenity.

Precedent

The application extension is only slightly over the permitted development allowance of 70 cubic metres in volume, and it has been stated by the applicant's agent that the design could be amended to reduce the volume by sloping the rear roof and adding a dormer. Whilst the precedent that would be set by approving the application would under normal circumstances be unwanted, due regard must be paid as to the eventual outcome of the extension whether as part of a planning application or as built under permitted development. The addition of a sloped roof with a dormer would not be a satisfactory solution and it is considered would be more detrimental to the visual amenity of the area that what currently exists.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-
1PPii – amended

The proposed extension does not detract from the existing local urban environment and has taken place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and without detraction from highway safety. It consequently does not conflict with the relevant policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) and the adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (LOC1, CH1, ERA1, DEV1, DEV4-5).

Subject to:-

1. Within three months of the date of this planning permission, the first-floor windows in the north and south side elevation shall be replaced with non-openable units (with the exception of one small top-hung opening light in each window) and fitted with obscured glass, in accordance with details to be submitted and approved in writing by the LPA. The windows shall thereafter be retained permanently with obscured glass & only small top-hung opening lights.
   Reason: *To prevent overlooking and to comply with policy AH2 of the Adur District Local Plan and DEV1 of the West Sussex Structure Plan.*

Case Officer: [signature] 13.05.08

PS 13/5/08