Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1061/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 49 Boundstone Lane Sompting West Sussex BN15 9QR

Proposal: Provision of further bedroom to first floor within roof with new gable end to rear (west) elevation. Single-storey side extension.

Date of site visit: 06.09.2016 (07.10.2016 to No.51)

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: Y – Amended Plans

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a detached bungalow on the west side of Boundstone Lane, within a predominantly residential area. It has previously been extended by a single-storey addition on the south side (formerly a garage), single-storey rear extension and rooms in the roof with front, north and south side dormers and a rear roof gable. Adjoining to the south, No.47 comprises a 2-storey detached house occupying a corner plot at the junction of Boundstone Lane with Greentrees Crescent. Adjoining to the north, No.51 comprises a detached bungalow. It has been enlarged by a rear conservatory, but its original hipped-roof remains intact. To the rear (west) are modern terraced houses in The Martlets.

Proposal

As originally submitted, permission was sought for an enlarged single-storey extension on the south side (2.2m wide x 9.5m deep), an enlargement of the rear roof gable by extending the existing roof ridge 3.7m westwards over the existing ground-floor extension, plus enlarged north and south side dormers (by 3.7m in each case). Following discussions, an amended drawing has been received omitting the enlarged side dormers.

[The drawings indicate that the guttering on the side extension would overhang the common boundary and an amended Certificate has also been submitted.]

Relevant Planning History:

Single-storey rear extension replacing conservatory: Approved (ADC/0473/10)
Front dormer: Approved (ADC/0156/09)

Consultations:

Southern Water: A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required. It is possible a sewer now deemed to be public crosses the site and should any sewer be found during construction works an investigation will be required to ascertain its condition, the number of properties served and potential means of access from further works commence. The application is advised to discuss the matter with Southern Water. It is for the developer to make suitable provision for the disposal of surface water based on the priorities set out in Part H3 of the Building Regulations.

Representations:

7 letters of objection have been received from, or on behalf of, the occupiers of 51 Boundstone Lane and 1 objection has been received from the occupier of No.47. The concerns are summarised as follows:-

- The proposed enlargements will turn the property into a flat-roofed house which will be out of keeping with other properties;
- The side room at No.51 used as a study has only 1 window on the south side positioned 0.5m from the boundary. A previous extension to the property has already restricted light to No.51 as it is much closer than the recommended 2m spacing between buildings. The proposal is too close and is an over-development in this road mainly consisting of pitched-roof bungalows where dormers also have pitched roofs.
- The proposal is a gross overdevelopment and will take natural light from the lounge window (18 inches wide) as it will be in constant shade from the development and it will take light from the conservatory because it will be overshadowed by approximately half its length.
- The existing extension at No.49 means that the light needs to be switched on all the time in the second bedroom (used as a study), it is feared the same will happen to the lounge;
- The distance between the wall of No.51 and the neighbouring property is only 5 foot which reduces the amount of natural light quite dramatically during the Autumn/Winter time when the sun is lower in the sky. The proposed development should be refused on grounds of overdevelopment and loss of natural light to the adjoining property.
- The proposed first-floor extension will overlook the garden/pool at No.47 causing a loss of privacy and a reduction in the value of the property. [The latter point is not a matter that can be taken into consideration.]
- Removal of trees on the south side of the property has not been declared. [There are no trees to be removed.]

Following notification of the amended plans 4 further letters of objection have been received from, or on behalf of, the occupiers of 51 Boundstone Lane commenting:-

- The size and scale of the extension will over-dominate No.51;
- The extension will result in significant loss of privacy, daylight and sunlight to the lounge window (18 inches wide) and will take light from the conservatory at No.51 especially during Autumn and Winter months, it and will be visually overbearing, creating a claustrophobic effect;

- The extension fails ‘The 45º Test’;
- The proposals do not comply with the Council’s requirement for a 1m gap between the building and the boundary;
- There is only a 5 foot gap between the properties and in view of their closeness it dramatically reduces the amount of natural light received; the proposal is completely unreasonable.
- The existing extension at No.49 means that the light needs to be switched on all the time in the second bedroom (used as a study);
- The proposals remain an excessive overdevelopment, resulting in loss of light and sunlight, the original objection stands;
- If an additional bedroom is needed it is suggested that the proposed ground-floor extension is used for this instead of a gym;
- The extension is contrary to Local Plan policy.

Sompting Parish Council made comments in support of the application.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
SPG DC Standard No.3 “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings”
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

The property lies within an established residential area and there is no objection in principle to extensions and alterations to domestic dwellings. The key issues are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The appearance of the bungalow has been much altered by the addition of dormers in the original modest hipped roof. [Although it appears from the planning history that the side dormers and rear gable were undertaken as ‘permitted development’ with formal permission sought only for the front dormer.] It was considered that the proposed enlargement of the side dormers as originally submitted would add to their existing ungainly proportions further detracting from the appearance of the bungalow. This element of the proposals has now been omitted. Bearing in mind the relatively shallow angle of the original roof pitch, the rearwards enlargement of the rear roof gable would not be prominently visible from the street, nor would the resulting additional ‘bulk’ appear overdeveloped in the context of the larger 2-storey scale of No.47, or the slightly taller roof of No.51. It is worthy of note that the rearward extent of the proposed enlarged roof would roughly align with the rear of the existing hipped roof at No.51 (which as originally built extended deeper into its plot than the original bungalow at No.49).

The enlarged single-storey side extension would match the form and external finishes of the existing side element with 2 no. rooflights inserted into the flat roof. Glimpsed views of it from the street may be possible, infilling the remaining gap between the original flank of No.49 and the southern side boundary, but in view of its

modest single-storey scale it would not appear overly cramped and would have little if any impact on visual amenity.

Residential Amenity

The most affected properties are those adjoining to the north and south, No.47 and 51 respectively.

There is only a narrow gap separating No.49 and No.51 of approximately 1.5m. The existing north side dormer at No.49 has had some impact on the receipt of sunlight and daylight to a window in the south side of No.51 serving the study (second bedroom) and to a lesser extent the narrow lounge window to the west of it. The existing flat roofed rear extension at No.49 has also had a minor impact on receipt of daylight to the narrow lounge window at No.51. However, this narrow window is clearly secondary in character. The main aspect of the lounge would originally have faced west onto the rear garden. There are now glazed doors leading from the lounge into a conservatory attached to the rear of the bungalow. It is apparent that the receipt of daylight and sunlight to the lounge has also been impacted by the conservatory addition (with window blinds).

As originally submitted, the enlarged dormer on the north side of No.49 would have had a significantly worsening effect on the receipt of daylight and sunlight to both the study and secondary lounge window in the south side of No.51, and the vertical face of the dormer in relatively close proximity would have further heightened the existing sense of enclosure. However, as amended, the enlarged roof would have only a very limited impact on outlook from, and receipt of daylight and sunlight to, the windows in the south side of No.51 bearing in mind the relatively shallow angle of pitch and the effect of the existing rear extension. The existing outlook from the secondary lounge window will be slightly alleviated by the creation of a lower eaves height compared to the taller flat roof of the existing rear addition. The additional impact of the enlarged roof will be marginal and would not seriously worsen the living conditions of the occupiers of No.51 such as to justify refusal of the amended application.

No.47, a 2-storey house, has a smaller footprint than No.49, and has been extended by a single-storey extension wrapping around the north-west corner. The flank of the proposed single-storey extension at No.49 would adjoin the common side boundary and would extend further west than the adjacent single-storey element of No.47 by approximately 3m. There is a ground-floor window in the rear (west-facing) elevation of the wrap-around extension at No.47 serving a kitchen, and a narrower window in the north elevation which is secondary in character. The latter is positioned to the west of the flank wall of the existing side addition at No.49 but would become fully enclosed as a result of the proposed extension, reducing the amount of light obtained from this direction. As part of discussions the applicant was asked to reduce the depth of the proposed single-storey extension in order to relieve the impact on this window, but was unwilling to do so. It is noted there is also larger window on the east side of the single-storey wrap-around element at No.47. On balance, in view of the secondary character of the window on the north elevation, together with the existence of other windows on the east and west elevations of this single-storey element, it is considered the effect on the living conditions of No.47

would not be so severe as to warrant refusal. There has been objection to the single-storey element from the neighbour on this side.

The proposed roof enlargement would be sited to the north of No.47 and the resulting additional 'bulk' would have no significant impact on the receipt of daylight or sunlight to the latter. As the enlarged dormers have been omitted from the proposals there would now be no significant effect on overlooking of No.47 with the existing window in the rear gable of No.49 being re-positioned 3.7m westward. However, it is considered pertinent to restrict further openings in the side slopes of the enlarged roof by imposing a condition.

There is in excess of 20m between the new first-floor window in the rear gable and the properties to the rear in The Martlets which is considered would not give rise to unacceptable overlooking.

Recommendation4

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. 3-yr time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Matching Materials
4. No additional openings in side slopes of roof extension
5. No openings in south side of single-storey extension

Informative

1. Pro-Active Amendment
2. Southern Water

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 19.10.2016

Authorised by: Date: