Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1649/14 Recommendation – REFUSAL

Site: 81 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Construction of first floor extension over ground floor side extension to east elevation.

Date of site visit: 16/12/14

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a detached two storey house built in 1919 located on the north side of Old Fort Road. The dwelling is a large detached house with a hipped roof, tiled in glazed cobalt blue roof tiles. To the east side is a two storey extension which makes up part of the east side boundary with the adjacent bungalow, (no.83) also tiled in the distinctive tile. Currently the dwelling has a balcony across the whole of its front elevation which increases in depth over the front entrance portico.

There is currently a single storey extension to the eastern side of the property with a hipped roof which is built within 0.35 metres of the boundary to the east with no. 83 the adjacent bungalow. This was granted permission under planning application ADC/0413/09.

Prior to this consent being granted permission was sought for a two storey side extension under ADC/0323/09. This proposal comprised a two storey part-side, part front extension which incorporated a front balcony. This scheme was refused under delegated powers. The design of the extension was not considered to be subordinate to the host dwelling. It was considered unsympathetic in terms of its design and would have a detrimental effect to the visual amenity of the surrounding area. The scale of the extension and proximity to the boundary would have a particularly overbearing and unneighbourly effect on the adjacent bungalow. The reasons for refusal are set out below: -

1. The proposed extension, by reason of its large size and unsympathetic design, would be out of keeping in scale and appearance with the existing building and would detract to an unacceptable extent from the visual amenities and residential environment of the locality and thereby conflict with the policies if the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7)
2. The proposed extension, by reason of its large size and unneighbourly design and siting would be detrimental to the residential amenities of the locality, resulting in loss of privacy and

an overbearing effect on the adjoining property, contrary to the policies of the Adur District Local Plan, (AH7.)

Following this a revised application was submitted for a two storey side extension under reference ADC/0164/10. This showed a scaled down version of the former refused application. The two storey side extension was set in by 1 metre from the boundary wall and set back from the main front wall in a subordinate fashion by 0.1 metres and from the projecting balcony by 1.7 metres. It was considered by the officer that the revised application would have a reduced effect on the neighbouring dwelling and the street scene as a whole however it remained the stance that the extension would clearly be an incongruous feature. This application was also refused under delegated powers for the following reason: -

1. The proposed extension by reason of its large size and unsympathetic flat roofed design, would be out of keeping in scale and appearance with the existing building and would detract to an unacceptable extent from the visual amenities and residential environment of the locality and thereby conflict with the policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7)

Subsequently an appeal was lodged and allowed for the two storey side extension. The inspector considered that the set back from the front of the building and set in from the side would allow the extension to appear subordinate to the main dwelling and the ‘gap between it and the adjoining bungalow would, In my view, be sufficient to avoid it appearing cramped or creating a terracing effect. ‘

The current application seeks consent for a first floor side extension above the existing single storey side extension.

The scheme which was previously allowed on appeal (ADC/0164/10) is a material consideration in the determination of this current application. There are however significant differences to the schemes. The proposed extension is to be built above the existing single storey extension, therefore it is to be closer to the boundary than the scheme permitted on appeal. There are also differences in the fenestration detailing. The current scheme also includes the removal of the roof of the existing two storey addition which is set back to the eastern side of the building. Also to include the removal of the gable wall this is to be replaced with a flat roof with parapet.

The proposed extension is 2.6 metres wide, 5.4 metres in depth to a maximum height of 5.2 metres. To the front elevation a ground floor window is proposed with porthole style window at first floor. Two windows are proposed on the side, eastern, elevation.

Consultations:

none

Representations: 1 letter of objection received from the owner/occupier of no. 83 Old Fort Road. The following concerns are raised.

- The plans submitted are not detailed enough to show the exact work that would be undertaken to the east side of the extension.
- The window on the first floor will overlook our property invading privacy as would the balcony with the parapet along the east side of the extension,
- The size of the extension would block natural day/sun light.
- The ground floor extension is almost up to the boundary line, the extra height of another floor will create huge shadowing.
- Object to plans as they stand because of loss of natural day/sun light, loss of privacy and a feeling of overpowering of our property.
- Shadowing and loss of sunlight is already experienced due to the first original extension at 81 even in the summertime.

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

There is no objection in principle to the proposed development which involves an extension to an existing dwelling house.

Visual amenity

The previous scheme that was approved on appeal showed the two storey extension to be set in from the boundary with no.83 by 1 metre and from the front main wall by 0.1 metres and the projecting balcony by 1.7 metres. The current scheme shows the same set back however due to the existence of the single storey extension which the first floor addition will be built upon there will only be a set in from the side of 0.35 metres. The extension therefore appears more prominent and less subordinate than the previous scheme as it is 2.6 metres wide and not 2 metres as the previous scheme.

It will be cramped within the space between the existing dwelling and side boundary. It is considered that this impact is to a significant degree to warrant a refusal in this case. The inspector refers in her appeal decision to the previous scheme: 'The proposed extension would be set back from the front elevation and set in 1 metre from the boundary with no. 83. It would therefore appear subordinate to the main dwelling and the gap between it and the adjoining bungalow would, in my view, be sufficient to avoid it appearing cramped or creating a terracing effect.'

It is considered that the Inspector's conclusion regarding the previous scheme cannot be applied to the current scheme. The reduction in spacing to 0.35metres will have a significant impact. The combination of lack of spacing and the increased width allowing the extension to be over all more dominant will be detrimental to the

character and appearance of the existing building and street scene. The appeal decision does not give justification for this increase in scale, massing and proximity to the boundary.

As stated above the current proposal also looks to remove the existing pitched roof on the two storey addition. The applicant's agent states in his covering letter that "It is now proposed that the roof of this structure, which appears rather incongruous, should be removed, including the gable wall, and be replaced with a flat roof with parapet matching the already approved elevation."

This work will give rise to a large, vast side elevation, emphasising the expanse of extension both existing and proposed. The large, uniform flat roof, 12 metres wide, would further reaffirm that the proposed first floor addition is not a subservient feature.

In the previous scheme, ADC/0164/10, granted on appeal the inspector justified the flat roof addition as a link bringing together the different parts of the building, i.e. the existing pitched roof main roof and the pitched roof of the existing addition. "The use of a flat roof to link together the different parts of the building is an appropriate design solution since it would avoid the need to disrupt either of the existing roof forms." The previous scheme provides a subordinate 'link'.

The appeal scheme showed more sympathetic fenestration details than the current scheme. The proposed porthole design at first floor and ground floor window do not relate in design or scale to the character of the existing building or replicate any existing detailing.

Residential amenity

The Inspector did not consider the appeal scheme to result in any loss of light or overbearing impact to the occupiers of the adjacent bungalow to the east no. 83 Old Fort Road. This was due to the set in of the extension and the position of the extension in relation to the windows of habitable rooms.

The current scheme has less of a set in at 0.35 metres (the previous scheme was 1 metre.) The windows in the side elevation of the current scheme are smaller than those previously approved although they are not shown as being fixed shut and fitted with obscure glazing. However a condition could be attached to ensure this was the case if necessary. The current proposal does however result in a reduction of overall roof height adjacent to the boundary. It is considered on balance, in the light of the previous appeal decision and the proposed changes to the scheme that there would be no significant adverse impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent bungalow that would warrant a refusal on this ground in this case.

The neighbour's concerns in relation to the loss of privacy due to a balcony with the parapet along the east side of the extension can be overcome by condition. Or as stated in the appeal decision "any intention to provide access to the flat roof and to do so would require alterations to the roof which would in all likelihood require planning permission. I consider concerns about the use of the roof as a balcony are therefore unfounded."

Recommendation

REFUSAL

1. The proposed extension, by reason of its size, form, unsympathetic detailing and proximity to the boundary would, in conjunction with the other alterations proposed, be out of keeping in scale, design and appearance to the existing dwelling and appear visually overbearing in relation to the neighbouring property, No.83, and the streetscene generally . The proposal would detract to an unacceptable extent from the visual amenities and residential environment of the locality thereby conflicting with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7)

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 5th January 2015

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 05.01.2015