Expires 01.07.09

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0184/09 Recommendation - Permit

Site: **393 Upper Shoreham Road Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5NF**

Proposal: **Single-storey rear extension**

The Application

The application property is the eastern half of a pair of semi-detached, 1930's bungalows located on the south side of the street, on ground which slopes down to the south, within the built up area of Shoreham.

The proposal is for a rear single-storey extension, with dummy pitched roof which would be 'L' shaped in design (as amended). The extension would project from the rear of the bungalow by 3.5m where it is adjacent to the common boundary with the attached neighbour (No.395). It would be 3.5m deep for 3.4m of the 7m total width, and then would step out to be 5.3m for the remainder of the width. The extension would be 3.9m in height to the top of the dummy pitch roof.

The application property and its attached neighbour both originally were built with a rear projecting elements (with hipped roofs) on the far east and west of the rear of the dwellings. At some point the space between the projecting elements of both dwellings has been in-filled with a flat-roofed extension which adjoins at the boundary, both being the same depth. The application property has had a hipped roof extension added to the top of the whole of the rear portion of their extension/ rear projection, and includes front side and rear pitched roof dormers.

To the east No.391 is the western half of a pair of semi-detached houses, it too has been extended to the rear with a single storey extension towards the west and a rear conservatory located towards the east, behind a 2m fence. Where the two extensions meet there is a step in the depth but the conservatory projects to the same depth as the rear elevation of the application bungalow. There are two windows in the west elevation which are both obscurely glazed. The two properties are separated by a shared drive which is 3m in width.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: There have been two letters of representation.

The owner of the attached bungalow states that they have no objection in principle, but there is concern at the visual effect of the side wall which adjoins

there property. They insist that the wall is attractively rendered with a light coloured finish.

The owner of the site to the east (No. 391) has been shown the amended plans showing an increase in the length of the east elevation and has confirmed in writing that he has no objections towards them.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
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 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.'
PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies
Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general.

Development Control Standard No.3 states that single-storey extensions located within 1m of the boundary with an attached property should usually be no deeper that 3.5m to prevent loss of outlook; that a garden length of at least 11m should be retained and that a flat roof would usually be acceptable.

Visual amenity
The proposed extension (as amended) would be L shaped, and only part of the longer east side elevation would be obliquely visible from the road, which is on higher level. As a result it is not considered that the size or design of the extension would be harmful to the character of the building or the surrounding area.

The proposed extension has been designed to match the existing dwelling in terms of the proposed materials, with the flank walls being constructed of painted render atop a low brick plinth, and with a tiled dummy pitch roof.

Whilst the design of the extension comprises a dummy pitched roof that ties into the existing roof extension to the rear of the dwelling, the combination of a number of different roof elements will look a little cluttered and busy. Despite this fact it is still considered that this would not have such a harmful effect on the visual amenity of the surrounding area to warrant a refusal solely on this basis.

The attached neighbour has requested that the flank wall which will make up the boundary, is rendered and painted an 'attractive' colour. The applicant proposes to render the wall and paint it to match the existing dwelling and a planning condition will be attached to confirm this point.

Residential amenity

The Council's published Development Control Standard No.3 requires that extension be limited to 3.5m in depth when they are within 1m of a boundary with an attached property. The applicant has amended the scheme to comply, and it is now considered that the proposals would not result in a loss of outlook from the rear rooms of No.395. Additionally the two dwellings are south facing, and consequently they receive a number of hours of direct sunlight. It is considered the proposals would not restrict the amount of natural daylight to the attached bungalow.

The house directly to the east does not have an outlook directly onto the shared drive or to the south, and views of the roof of the extension from their conservatory would be restricted by their 2m high boundary fence and the remaining single storey garage, although part of the dummy pitch roof would be visible above. Whilst an extension of this length (5.3m) within 3m of an adjoining property could be arguably refused on the grounds of loss of outlook it is considered that as the neighbouring dwellings main outlook from their conservatory would not be affected and no objection has been raised that in this case, on balance, the extension would be acceptable.

A garden length of 33m would be retain which would safeguard the amenity of the residential properties directly to the south.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPi

1. C1Ci
2. C14Ri – 05.06.09 AH7 of the ADLP
3. C18Eiv – east or west AH7 of the ADLP
4. C12Eii

Case Officer: [redacted]

Date: 22/6/09 PS 22/6