Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0177/13 **Recommendation – Approve**

Site: **12 Norman Crescent, Shoreham-By-Sea**

Proposal: **Single storey rear extension to replace conservatory and rear decking.**

Date of site visit: 27th March 2013

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a detached two storey dwelling within a street of similar dwellings on the southern side of Norman Crescent. There is an integral garage, front driveway and conservatory to the rear. As with the properties either side the rear garden is long and south facing.

Permission is sought to demolish the existing conservatory and to erect a single storey rear extension. The extension is to have a sloping roof and will extend by 4 metres on the eastern side stepping out to 5 metres on the western side. The main part being 4 metres in depth. The extension has a maximum width of 8.5 metres, almost the full width of the rear of the dwelling. It has a maximum height of 3.5 metres including the two rooflights which protrude from the roof level, the height reduces to a minimum of 2.9 metres. The extension is proposed to be finished in white render with mid grey powder coated aluminium windows and bi folding doors. The roof is single ply membrane with 'standing seam' this will have a grey finish.

The extension will provide a kitchen/diner. Proposed rear decking also forms part of this application. The decking will surround the extension and will allow access from the rear of the extension to the garden which is at a lower ground level. It will be 0.45 metres above ground level with steps leading to the lawn.

Representations: 1 letter of representation received from the owner/occupiers of No. 14 Norman Crescent expressing concern that the proposed extension will result in loss of light to the sun room which is used as a family dining room. Although the room is south facing the evening light comes from the west. The proposed brick built extension at the side of our window which will extend a further metre coupled with a 7-8ft Bay tree at the end of the proposed extension our light into this room will be reduced considerably.

Relevant Planning Policies
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'

National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading of the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

The proposed extension and decking is to the rear of the dwelling and is therefore not visible within the street scene. The extension will be visible from the rear of the dwellings either side of the site.

The extension is to replace an existing rear conservatory. The proposed extension will be larger than the existing conservatory with a sloping roof. It is however considered to be in keeping in design, size and scale with the existing detached dwelling house. There is a long rear garden and the extension will be subservient to the host dwelling.

The materials used will be appropriate to the main building. The existing building is finished with render and brick with tile hanging on the rear bay. The extension is to be finished with white render with mid grey powder coated aluminium windows and bi folding doors. The roof is to be single ply membrane with standing seam; this will have a grey finish. The materials used and proposed design give a crisp, contemporary finish to the extension whilst keeping the roof height to a minimum. The roof material allows for a low gradient roof slope, this could not be achieved with a traditional roof tile or slate. The roof level will therefore sit under the existing first floor bay and will not conflict with the tile hanging. This was the case at no. 8 Norman Crescent where a flat roof rear extension has been built with a parapet which screens the base of the bay and appears as a bulky, high extension in comparison to the design proposed in this case.

Although the grey windows, bi-folding doors and roof will not strictly match the materials used in the existing dwelling. The simple form of the extension allows for the use of such materials that differ from that of the main house. It will represent a contrasting addition. The use of matching white window frames and white render would result in a very ‘white’ rear elevation. The contrasting mid grey window and door frames is more aesthetically pleasing.

The raised decking around the extension allows for the change in levels between the extension and the garden area. Due to the depth of the plot a large amount of lawn will remain, therefore not impacting on the overall character of the area.

Residential amenity

The main properties to be affected by the proposed extension are No. 14 to the east and No. 10 to the west. No. 14 has an existing rear flat roof ‘sunroom’

addition which as existing has outlook and aspect to the rear (south) and side onto the application site. The boundary fence is relatively low and therefore the side window of the sunroom has clear views onto the side of the existing conservatory at No. 12. This is currently an unneighbourly relationship and unfortunate that that neither of these side windows are fitted with obscure glazing to over come this mutual overlooking. However this overlooking may not have been a concern for the neighbours as existing.

The owner/occupiers of No. 14 have objected to the proposal on the basis of the loss of light to this room as a result of the proposed extension. There is concern that as the extension will be closer to the boundary, deeper and will have a solid side wall that it will result in loss of light to the side window of the neighbouring extension. There is a large shrub/tree within the application site adjacent to the boundary which the neighbour's have stated also will contribute to the reduction in light received.

It is acknowledged that due to the unusual arrangement of a side clearly glazed window in such close proximity to the boundary there will be a loss of light as a result of the proposed extension. However it must be acknowledged that there is also southerly aspect and light received to this room. They have also stated that the vegetation on the boundary contributes to this loss of light. It is likely that due to the proposed decking being build in this area that this shrub will be lost therefore allowing for more light ot be received to the adjacent sun room. The loss of light to the side window is however not considered to be a reason for refusal. Consideration must be given to the impact of any construction that could be built adjacent to this boundary which would benefit from permitted development. A single storey extension could be built up to 4 metres in depth, the full width of the dwelling therefore an extension of the same depth could be built closer to the boundary than the proposed extension, therefore possibly having a greater impact. This is a material consideration that must be taken into account in the determination of this planning application.

Although the owners/occupiers of No. 14 have not commented on the existing poor relationship which exists with regards to overlooking between both conservatories the proposed extension is considered to be an improvement on the existing overlooking situation. The solid blank eastern elevation of the extension will allow for privacy between the neighbouring dwellings.

To the west is No. 10 Norman Crescent, this dwelling has a rear conservatory built close to the boundary with the application site. There is existing vegetation on the application site which screens the conservatory. This vegetation will however be lost due to the proposed extension being built in close proximity to the boundary fence. The side of the extension adjacent to the boundary extends to 5 metres, (larger than that which would be allowed under permitted development.) It would extend slightly further than the existing conservatory at No. 10. It would be visible above the existing boundary fence. It is not considered that there will be any loss of light or overbearing impact as a result of the proposed extension that would warrant a refusal in this case. The neighbour's conservatory faces south and this main aspect will not be affected. The blank side elevation will mean that there will be no overlooking to the side windows of the conservatory.

Amended plans have been submitted which show the decking to be reduced away from the boundary of no. 10 to remove any activity and potential prolonged overlooking in close proximity to the boundary of No. 10. The proposed decking adjacent to No. 14 and the existing sunroom extension is considered to be acceptable as this area is mainly for access to the side of the dwelling. It is unlikely that the occupiers will use this space for seating or prolonged recreation use which would result in any loss of privacy or unneighbourly form of development. Existing shrub planting within the curtilage of No.14 will provide an element of screening. Due to the design of the extension and associated decking the area of decking directly to the rear of the bi-folding doors would be where outdoor activity would be focused. Both boundary fences are lower than the permitted 2 metres and therefore if there were any concerns with regards to overlooking then additional trellis or screening could be added up to 2 metres in height without planning permission.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7)

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. The extension hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: -
   (21)000 Rev B - received 17th April 2013
   (31)002 Rev A - received 20th February 2013
   (31)003 Rev A - received 20th February 2013
   (31)000 Rev C - received 17th April 2013
   (31) 001 Rev D - received 17th April 2013
   (11)000 Rev A - received 17th April 2013
3. No windows or openings shall be inserted in the east or west side elevation of the extension hereby proposed except without prior consent from the LPA.
4. The extension hereby permitted shall be finished in materials as stated on the approved drawings (31) 002 Rev A - received 20th Feb 2013, to include painted white render, facing brick work base to match existing, single ply membrane roof with 'standing seam' and powder coated aluminium windows in mid grey.

Informatives

1. Precautionary land contamination

If during development, any visible contaminated or odorous material, (for example asbestos containing material, stained soil, petrol/diesel/solvent odour, underground tanks or associated pipework) not previously identified, is found to be present at the site, then no further development (unless otherwise

agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until it has been investigated by the developer. The Local Planning Authority must be informed immediately of the nature and degree of the contamination present and a method statement detailing how the unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with must be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing before being implemented.

2. 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 letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 17th April 2013

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 17 April 2013