Application Number: ADC/0200/07 **Recommendation - APPROVE**

Site: **5 Ravensbourne Avenue, Shoreham-by-Sea**

Proposal: **Enlargement of bungalow into a two-storey four-bedroom house**

The Application

The application relates to a 1930's detached bungalow on the west side of Ravensbourne Avenue. The dwelling is constructed of rendered walls with brick quoin detailing and a plain tiled hip roof. The property has previously been extended with a conservatory on the south-west corner of the dwelling and with rooms in the roof with a west facing dormer, both under 'permitted development' rights.

The proposal is to enlarge the bungalow into a two-storey four-bedroom house; the proposed second storey would provide three double-bedrooms, a bathroom and study.

To the north of the property, sited on higher ground, is a two-storey detached house (No.7), which has been extended with a two-storey north side extension (for the full depth of the house). It has a first-floor balcony on top of a flat-roofed extension on the south side of the rear elevation, giving views towards the south and west.

To the south, on lower ground, is a detached bungalow (No.3). The bungalow itself is 2.75m from the common side boundary with the application property, the intervening space being occupied by its attached garage.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: 3 letters of objection and one with no objection have been received from neighbouring and nearby residents.

The owner of No.26 The Drive to the rear (west) is concerned there would be loss of privacy, with overlooking of both their house and garden. They also object to loss of outlook and comment that the size of development is too big for the site.

The owner of No.24 The Drive feels that the proposed works would dramatically impinge on their privacy, and would provide an outlook that would be dominated and claustrophobic. They feel that the houses in the vicinity, including their own, have insufficiently long gardens to allow appropriate measures to be taken to restore privacy should the works go ahead, and therefore strongly object to the proposed work.

The owners of the house to the north, No.7 Ravensbourne Avenue, object on grounds that the height of the proposed new roofline at the back of the property would shade considerably their west and south-facing balcony and patio seating area, also leading to lower light levels in their dining room.

The owner of No.2 opposite has no objection to the proposed development.

[NB. requests are made by the residents of No's 24 & 26 The Drive to speak at the committee meeting]

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (WSCC 2005): DEV1, DEV4-5.
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 Supplementary Planning Guidance including:-
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions 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, relating specifically to extensions and alterations to dwellings, states that they should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable loss of light or privacy or have an overbearing effect on the neighbouring dwelling and be sympathetic to the original dwelling. Supplementary guidance in DC Standard No.3 'Extensions & Alterations to Dwellings' states that two-storey side extensions should retain, in most circumstances, at least a 1m gap from the side boundary. It goes on to state that principal windows on the rear elevation of rear extensions should be 22m from principal windows of dwellings at the rear.

Visual amenity

The design of the proposed additional storey is not considered to be out of character for the locality, using a similar roof shape to other properties in the street and continuing the bay window upwards. Although the appearance of the northern side would be of a two-storey house, the southern side (adjacent to the bungalow at No.3) would appear more subservient with the introduction of a cat-slide roof, which would have an eaves level the same as the original bungalow, and therefore not appear too dominant in the context of the streetscape.

The flank wall of the north elevation of the resultant house would be increased in height from 3m at eaves level to 5.3m, which is still 0.8m below that of the neighbouring house. The existing two attached garages between both No's 3 and 5 would give enough separation to prevent the proposal from causing an

overpowering or cramped appearance. A 1m wide passage way exists on either side of the boundary between No's 5 and 7 which complies with the above DC Standard relating to two-storey extensions, which is considered relevant in this instance.

Residential amenity – overlooking

The properties in The Drive to the rear (west) are sited on rising ground similar to the application property. Some of the houses have been extended at the rear and No.24 has recently obtained permission for a rear extension. The distances between the dwellings in The Drive and those in Ravensbourne Avenue (35m minimum) is greatly in excess of the Council's 22m minimum standard and is considered ample to avoid there being unacceptable loss of privacy or outlook.

Residential amenity – sunlight

The balcony of the property to the north (No.7) is located on top of a single-storey rear extension which projects rearwards 0.5m beyond the rear wall of the application property. The dining room housed within this single-storey extension is served by rear patio doors and there are no windows in the southern side elevation. The application property has a flat-roofed rear dormer which, as existing, has an impact on the balcony. The proposed additional storey would reduce sunlight from the south to the neighbour's balcony but, due to its size and westerly outlook, it is not considered that it the impact would be to an unacceptable degree such as to justify refusal of the proposed development.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

The proposed development would not detract from the existing local urban environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and without detraction from highway safety. It would consequently not conflict with the relevant policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7, AT12) and the adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (LOC1, CH1, DEV1, DEV4-5).

Subject to:-

1. C1Ci (Standard time limit)
2. C12Ei (External materials to match existing)
3. C18Ci (Glazing in first-floor north side elevation to be of obscured glass)
4. C18Ei (No windows to be formed in the north or south side walls of the extension without planning permission)

.....