Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1272/19 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 76 Upper Brighton Road, Sompting, BN15 0LB

Proposal: Proposed single storey flat roof rear extension, pitched roof front extension and flat roof side extension. Demolition of existing garage and construction of single storey pitched roof garage in similar location.

Date of site visit: 05.09.2019

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The property is as detached bungalow set back some 24m from the pavement and from the main properties within the street. The property also has an approx. 23m long rear garden. Its direct neighbours, no's 78A & 78B are set back further than the application site, but these are fairly recently constructed infill properties which replaced one dwelling with two.

The property is off of the A27, a busy trunk road; with a school directly opposite (The Sir Robert Woodard Academy); and there is a footbridge situated close to the application site, which is over the A27 to the school. The locality is predominantly residential in nature.

Proposal

The proposal seeks permission to extend the dwelling with 3no. separate extensions, also to demolish the existing detached garage and replace with a larger detached garage.

- The existing porch on the south elevation to be extended forward;
- The existing conservatory on the east elevation to be removed and replaced with and extended southwards, by a brick built extension;
- Provide an extended lounge by widening to the west and extending north; and
- Replace the existing detached garage with an enlarged detached garage.

***Planning History**:*

S/84/76 Proposed extension to form new living/dining room and new porch. **Approved 16.08.1976**

Representations: Letter of objection from neighbour at 78A Upper Brighton Road:

- Concerned the height of the lounge extension in relation to my property as my front door faces the new extension
- Do not want to feel as though construction is so close to my border that it would create an alleyway leading to my front door and restricted light
- If I am assured that the roof height will not exceed the permitted 3m, being only 1m from my fence, it will be within current planning laws and therefore I cannot object;
- The drawings show that the rear extension will be coming to another 3.295m from the existing extension
- The owner thought the rear extension was only coming out 2.745m to the edge of the existing patio, but the Agent seems to have made it bigger without consultation
- From my aspect, the least it comes out the further it is away from my front door the better
- Could the plans be amended to be in accordance with the owners original request
- The owner was only planning on putting a standard pair of doors on this return which are only some 1.8m wide so 9 feet would be more than enough
- Only safeguarding the saleability of my property for the future
- Please visit my address in order to understand the points raised

Sompting Parish Council: No objection

Consultation Responses: None

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan: Policies 1, 15
DM Standard No.2 SPG - Extensions and alterations to dwellings
Planning Policy Framework (2019)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

The proposal is acceptable in principle, subject to its effect on the visual and residential amenity of the neighbouring properties and the character of the street scene in general.

Visual Amenity

The property is set back from the pavement by some 24m and its neighbour at no. 74 is set back from the pavement by approx. 16m, whilst no. 78A is set back by approx. 39m. This staggered nature of construction adds interest to the built form at this point.

Going through the construction point by point and starting at the front with the garage.

The current garage is a small flat roof construction which is not readily noticeable within the street scene as landscaping has been put in place and parking of vehicles also add to the screening of the structure. The garage will

be larger by some 1.2m in width and the same in length. It will also be greater in height by approx. 1m. The height difference is brought about by the fact that the flat roof is being replaced by a hipped roof.

The new garage will be noticeable from the street, but it is not considered to be out of character with the visual amenities of the area as the roof is hipped which will tie in with the roof of the bungalow. As per the existing garage, the replacement will be some 300mm off of the west boundary, the other side of the boundary being the drive leading to the neighbouring property no. 78A. Also, at this point there is limited hedging, thereby the side of the garage in particular will be viewed from this property. Even though it can be viewed, it will not result in unacceptable harm to this neighbour, particularly due to the fact that it is away from the dwelling house, and next to a driveway.

The enlarged porch, on the west side of the dwelling, will be the same width as existing but will be approx. 2m longer and it will have a false pitch roof being some 600mm higher than the original flat roof. The walls will be rebuilt to be brick built, allowing it to be insulated. It will thereby not have the side glazing as the original but will have a small side window only which will be to the new shower room being created at this point within its construction. The shower room will be an en-suite to the existing bedroom. The front section will still have the entrance door within it.

The position of the replacement/enlarged porch will be behind the detached garage, and thereby will not be readily viewed from the street scene. It will though be partially viewed by the neighbouring property no. 78A, but again will be forward of no. 78A next to the driveway, thereby will not be resulting in any harm to the neighbouring property.

The rearranging of the existing conservatory on the east side of the dwelling will again generally see its rebuilding from a single skin to a cavity brick construction. It will be no wider than the existing conservatory but will be longer by approx. 2m. The wall between the two rooms will be removed in order to provide an enlarged kitchen. Its roof will be maintained as a flat roof, but 3no. rooflights will be installed within the roof .

The new room will not be readily viewed from outside the site or from the neighbouring property no. 74.

Lastly, the lounge will be extended to the west and to the north, making the lounge to fit the full width of the property. The rectangular extension will also be extending the existing lounge to the north by 3.295m. This extension will be flat roof as per the existing lounge extension. The extension will be no wider than the existing dwelling and thereby will be approx. 1.2m from the side boundary to no. 78A.

This neighbour has written in with his concerns regarding this section of the proposal as he is concerned that the development would result in an alleyway leading to his front door; it would be too high, particularly in relation to his front door; he needs assurance that the height would not exceed 3m; it is longer that his original discussions with the owner lead him to believe.

On a site inspection of the neighbouring site at no. 78A, it was ascertained that the front door was to the front of the property (a two storey semi-detached dwelling). The front door is close to the side boundary with the application site, and there is a hedge at this point. From the application site, it was clearly noted that the property is on lower land than no. 78A and that the hedge (which is on 78A land), is next to the point where the proposed lounge extension will be located and the fence next to the hedge will also be next to the proposed lounge extension. The top of the hedge comes above the eaves height on no. 76. It would seem therefore that the extension will not interfere with the existing space available to no. 78A.

The extension will be flat roofed and will be the same height as the existing extension, which is lower than the top of the hedging and approx. level or slightly lower than the top of the fence next to no. 78A. The gap between the side elevation of no. 78A and 76 will be approx. 2m, thereby allowing for the drop in land level at no. 76; the fact that the height of the extension will be the same as the existing extension (approx. 2.8m), which is also lower than the 3m height which would be satisfactory to the neighbour, it is thereby concluded that the proposed lounge extension will not result in detrimental harm to the existing amenities of the neighbouring property.

The depth of the extension was also a concern of the neighbour, he is of the view that it should not be deeper than the earlier discussion that he had with his neighbour, however, the difference between what has been applied for and the earlier discussion is approx. 550mm. It is not considered that the overall depth of the proposal will have a material impact onto the visual amenities of the neighbouring property, and thereby is considered acceptable.

Residential Amenity

The additional windows in the west side elevation serve the lounge extension and the new en-suite, which given their positioning, i.e. next to the driveway of no. 78A and next to the hedge and fence of the same property, none of the new windows will result in any overlooking of the neighbour, and thereby will not result in any material harm to existing residential amenity of that property. A condition requiring the windows to be obscure glass would be appropriate.

With regard to the new window on the east elevation, namely to the kitchen extension, it will be high level and thereby will not result in any material overlooking on no. 74. The rooflights to the kitchen will also not result in any overlooking of that property. As with the windows on the other side of the house, a condition requiring them to be obscure glazing would be appropriate.

Recommendation APPROVE, subject to the following conditions

1. Approved plans
2. Standard time limit
3. Materials to match existing
4. Windows to be obscure glazing

Informative(s)

1. Approved without amendment

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

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 07.11.2019

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 7 November 2019