Expiry: 27/11

Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1251/24 Recommendation – Reuse

Site: 121 Slonk Hill Road, Shoreham

Proposal: Raising of the roof ridge to create first floor.

Date of site visit: 8/11

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a detached hipped roof bungalow with an almost chalet or modular appearance. It is on the south side of Slonk Hill Road, one of 42 bungalows in a row with a similar eaves and ridgelines and similar appearance - Nos. 45 to 127 (odd).

The property shares a driveway on its west side with No. 123 with paired garages at the head. There is a 1.8 metre wide passage between Nos. 119 and 121. A single storey extension has been added to the rear and the bungalow has been clad in blue composite cladding.

The bungalows sit down from the road and the land continues to slope down into the rear gardens. There is also a modest climb up the road from The Drive, to the west, before sloping down towards the east beyond the site.

The site is not in a conservation area and is not listed. There are no protected trees on the site. There is no known flood risk associated with the site.

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/1631/24 – single storey rear extension. Granted 1.12.20

Consultations

None.

Representations

1 objection from No.118.

Unsightly and obscure in a row of similar properties.
Where this has been done on the north side has resulted in ugly properties, out of keeping and which have reduced light to neighbours either side.
It will overlook No. 118.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2, 15, 18,
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal involves upgrading 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

No.121 sits very close to its neighbour at No. 119 with virtually the same eaves and ridge lines. No.123 is the other side of the shared drive and it too has a very similar eaves and ridge line. In fact all the bungalows from No.45 to No. 127 have a similar scale with some modest variance due to the slight up and down of the road level. They are all set back from the pavement edge below road level.

In allowing the appeal at No. 42 in 2021 for an additional storey (**APP/Y3805/D/21/3281320** refers) the Inspector argued the following:

8. Regarding the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, while the proposed additional storey would depart from the prevalence of bungalow forms in the neighbourhood, the following combination of factors would help the enlarged building mass to visually assimilate within its setting.

9. There is some variation in building form and fenestration of dwellings in the vicinity of the appeal property, including various dormers on some dwellings. The undulating topography of Slonk Hill Road draws the eye, and viewed on the street from the west, the proposed development would appear against a backdrop of building mass on rising ground. Viewed on the street from the east, the raised height of the proposal would echo the peak of ground and building mass further along Slonk Hill Road. The substantial tree line to the rear off the host row of properties further adds to the visual variety of the backdrop. This backdrop of various elements, together with the pitched roof profile and use of materials matching the existing building would help the additional storey assimilate visually within its setting.

Expiry: 27/11

The same considerations do not apply in this case. There is little variation in the eaves and ridge lines of these bungalows. There is no tree back drop and the bungalows themselves are set down from the road and closer to it unlike those on the north side which sit up and away from the road. None of the properties at Nos. 45-127 have extended the original ridge height or added dormer windows. Those opposite the site on the north have also retained their more modest original scale and appearance.

The scale of the additional floor, would be visually intrusive in this row of bungalows. The resultant eaves and roofline proposed would obtrusively project above that of the adjoining bungalows and would appear too prominent and incongruous in the streetscene. The result would not constitute a good standard of design and the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area.

The design of the windows in the new floor, particularly on the frontage are also not in keeping with the very traditional design of the fenestration of these bungalows and would draw even greater attention to this extension to the detriment of the area.

Residential amenity

Given the nature of these shallow hipped roofs none of these bungalows have been extended into the roof space and therefore neighbouring gardens are not overlooked at close quarters. Roof extensions in the houses to the south in Downside are more than 20 metres off the back garden boundary of the site so have far less impact in terms of overlooking. The master bedroom gable window will overlook gardens either side to the detriment of neighbours' living conditions

Proposed side rooflights are either secondary windows or to non habitable rooms. Their position could be lifted to ensure they a have a cill level of at least 1.7 metres off finished floor level to prevent further direct overlooking.

In terms of light No. 119 has two obscure glazed side windows and so no significant harm will occur. Morning light will be impacted to side windows at No. 123 but not to a great extent given the paired driveway separation.

It is considered that an additional storey as proposed would result in harm to neighbours either side due to overlooking.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the following reason:

1. The proposed development by reason of its scale, height and design would introduce a visually dominant and obtrusive form of development culminating in harm to the appearance of this bungalow and the wider streetscene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Expiry: 27/11

2. First floor rear windows will overlook neighbouring gardens either side causing a loss of privacy to the detriment of their residential amenity. The proposal therefore contrary to Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reasons for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority is willing to discuss the best course of action and is also willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

Case Officer:	MOK	Date: 12/11/24
Authorised by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 12 November 2024