~~R-E~~
~~16/6/08~~
Expiry
11/6/08.

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0185/08 **Recommendation – Permit Application**

Site: **29 Herbert Road Sompting Lancing West Sussex**

Proposal: **Rooms in roof (with side gable and rear dormer) and two-storey rear extension (with roof terrace)**

The Application

The site is located within the built up area of Sompting, an existing hipped roof semi detached bungalow within a street of bungalows of various styles which have been extended in various ways over time with roof extensions, front, rear and side dormers and other alterations and extensions.

To the front of the bungalow there is a shared access driveway to the side with a small front garden area. To the rear is a garden which backs onto open countryside. The land slopes downwards from north to south and the attached bungalow to the north is at a higher ground level than the site with the ridge 1 metre higher than the ridge of no. 29 Herbert Road. The ground level continues to drop to the south with the neighbouring property, no. 27 Herbert Road at lower ground level than the site. The ground level also drops from east to west, the rear garden slopes downwards.

As existing there is a single storey rear extension accommodating a lounge and utility room. There is an external staircase which leads to an existing balcony area with access from a door at first floor level.

To the north at no. 31 Herbert Road the attached bungalow there is an existing rear two storey extension with a flat roof dormer to the rear roof slope. There is access from the dormer onto a balcony area which is enclosed by obscure glazed panels. Beyond this extension there is a conservatory. The total depth of these rear additions is 8.6 metres. There are history records relating to this neighbouring property dating back to 1971 and 1974, for an 'Addition to form lounge' and 'Bedroom and W.C in roof space.' However there are no plans available to view to show which developments these permissions relate to.

Permission was previously sought under application reference ADC/0026/08 to demolish the existing rear extension and balcony and to build a two storey extension with rear dormer, balcony and hip to gable roof extension. The proposed rear dormer was 6 metres wide, 2.4 metres high with a maximum depth of 3.1 metres. The rear two storey extension was 6 metres deep with a maximum height (due to ground levels) of 5.1 metres, with a maximum height including the balustrade of 6.2 metres.

This application was refused due to the loss of light and overbearing impact that would affect the property to the south no. 27 Herbert Road. The current application is a reduced scheme where the overall depth of the extension is reduced to 4 metres (as previously submitted the depth was 6 metres). Also differing from the previous application is a juliet balcony at first floor level which faces to the rear of the property.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: **-** No third party representations have been received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005) (saved policies): LOC1, DEV1
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No. 3 'Extension and Alterations to Dwellings'
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

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 overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general.

Residential Amenity

The main properties to be affected are no. 31 Herbert Road to the north, the attached bungalow and no. 27 Herbert Road to the south. As mentioned above no. 31 already has an existing extension and balcony similar to that proposed at no. 29, with the main part of the extension to the same level. As existing the balcony at no. 31 overlooks the site due to the higher level although there are obscured glazed screens to restrict this to some extent. The proposal will result in increased overlooking to no. 31 as the proposed balcony is higher than the balcony structure which exists. However due to the change in levels it is likely that the overlooking, although to some extent is mutual between these properties, will mainly be onto the site from the balcony at no. 31.

The main two storey part of the extension as existing at no. 31 extends further to the rear than the proposed extension and therefore there will be no overbearing impact on no. 31 in this case.

The proposed balcony and windows in the southern elevation of the proposal will face onto the rear garden of no. 27 to the south. However as mentioned above the existing rear balcony at the site does already over look the rear of this property. It will be conditioned that the first floor windows on the southern elevation are to be fitted with obscured glazing to be fixed to be permanently non-opening to limit overlooking and as stated on the plans there is to be obscurely glazed panels to limit over looking when the balcony is being used.

The previous proposal was considered to have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenities if the occupiers of no. 27 due to the bulk and depth of the proposed extension. The proposed extension was considered to be an unneighbourly form of development due to its combined depth of 6 metres and 6.2 metre height and proximity to this adjacent property.

The current scheme shows a reduction in depth which is considered to be to an acceptable degree. Due to the reduction in depth from 6 metres to 4 metres there is not considered to be an adverse impact on the adjacent property no. 27 which would warrant a refusal on residential amenity grounds. The windows on the side elevation of the extension, although large are to be fitted with obscured glazing and to be permanently non-openable.

Visual Amenity

The main part of the proposal is to the rear of the site and is therefore not visible within the street scene. The hip to gable extension, is considered to be acceptable in this case in the light of other similar developments within the street.

The proposed extension does result in a development which although to a lesser degree than the previous application is dominant in relation to the main dwelling house and is therefore not subservient to the existing building. The depth of the extension at 4 metres exceeds the Council's Development Control Standard for semi detached or terraced properties. Similarly the rear dormer is large and covers the majority of the rear roof slope.

The existing extensions and balcony at no. 31 should not set a precedent for similar development in this area. However having said this the proposal generally matches the appearance and scale of the adjacent development at no. 31 it does not extend as far to the rear as no. 31 which is deeper and also has a rear conservatory attached to the existing two storey extension. The proposed dormer is also lower than the ridge height of the bungalow unlike no. 31 and is therefore an improvement on the existing design. This proposal will balance the pair of semi detached bungalows. In the light of the above it is therefore not considered that a reason for refusal on visual amenity grounds is justifiable in this case.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :- 1PPi

1. C1Ci
2. C12Ei
3. C18Ei – southern
4. C18C3 – amended – The first floor windows in the southern side elevation of the building shall at all times be glazed with obscured glass and fixed to be permanently non-openable.

Case Officer...JBarker.....Date.....~~15/5/08~~.....
19\5\08.

JB 20/5/08