Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0805/15 Recommendation – REFUSE

Site: 93 Old Shoreham Road, Southwick, Brighton

Proposal: Part two storey and part single storey extension to side (east) elevation.

Date of site visit: 7/7/15

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is located on the north side of the old Shoreham Road set back from the main dual carriageway. A semi-detached, two-storey dwelling within a street of similar properties. The site is a corner plot with a detached single garage to the side. Ground level rises to the north/rear, with a similar property abutting the site to the north east on the corner, fronting onto the adjacent road, Lower Drive.

The application property has as existing a hip to gable extension with rear flat roof dormer which has been constructed under permitted development. Permission is sought for a part two storey, part single storey side extension. Originally submitted was a two storey side extension, 5.2 metres wide and 8.2 metres high, 6.8 metres in depth. It was advised by officers that this proposal was overly large and did not relate sympathetically to the existing dwelling. It was not a subservient addition, there was also concern that this scale of development would be detrimental to the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling, no. 1 Lower Drive.

As amended the proposal seeks permission for a reduced two storey side extension, 3 metres wide, 8.2 metres high and the same depth at 6.8 metres. In addition a single storey lean to element is attached the full depth of the dwelling, 1.7 metres wide with a maximum height of 3.7 metres. The revised proposal will provide an enlarged kitchen dining room at ground floor with W.C utility and study and a bedroom with ensuite at first floor. The amended plans also show the window serving the first floor en-suite to be obscurely glazed and permanently non-openable below 1.7 metres in height.

Consultations: None

Representations: Representation received from owner/occupier of 1 Lower Drive – Objection to Design, Overdevelopment, Privacy light and noise.

Objections: -
Loss of privacy as existing due to the roof extension.
Loss of privacy to back garden due to elevated ground.

Proposal would result in further unacceptable degree of overlooking and have an overbearing effect on my property.
Overlooking to rear conservatory.
Natural sunlight particularly in the winter months will be lost from the rear garden until evening time, impact on quality of life.
The windows will cause overlooking.
The roof lights in the roof vortex suggest that further development could take place in the roof.
Off street parking will be affected.
Parking is already excessive and could result in dangerous parking.

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. However the issues for consideration here are the impact of the proposed development on the visual amenity of the locality, street scene and existing dwelling and the impact upon the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings.

Visual amenity

The application site is prominent due to its position on the northern side of the Old Shoreham Road, being on slightly higher ground level than the dual carriageway below. It also being on a corner with low level garaging 'opening up' the site when viewed from the east. The ground level continues to increase to the north. It is considered that the proposal as amended is a significant improvement from that originally submitted with regards to visual amenity. The reduction in scale of the two storey element and the single storey lean to addition allow the extension to appear more modest in scale and subordinate. The reduction in ridge height also adds to this subservience. The window design and proportions are also improved matching those of existing. In visual amenity terms only it is not considered that the spacing between the dwellings in impacted detrimentally.

Residential amenity

The main property to be affected is no. 1 Lower Drive the semi detached dwelling to the north of the site. This property is sited at right angles to the application site and due to this positioning and proximity of the dwellings the garden at no. 1 is very limited and there is a rear conservatory.

The scale and siting of the extension, being positioned to the south of no. 1, results in the proposed extension having a significantly detrimental impact. The proposal will be extremely overbearing and oppressive when viewed from within the rear garden of no. 1 and the rear conservatory, there would also be some loss of light. The building as existing is dominant due to its scale and siting and the addition of the proposed two storey extension will exacerbate this to an unacceptable degree. There would also be a loss of open aspect to the south which within this limited rear amenity space with limited open aspect would be significantly detrimental.

The extension as amended reduces the bulk of the two storey addition however the scheme as amended still fundamentally has the same impact. Any two storey form of development at this site would be significantly detrimental to the residential amenities of the current and future occupiers of no. 1 Lower Drive. The orientation of the buildings, their proximity, changes in ground level and the way the gardens are divided allows for a very unfortunate relationship which does not give rise to a suitable two storey solution in this case.

The option of a single storey extension only was suggested as an alternative that would be more likely to be supported however this would be subject to consideration of any proposed plans or consideration of permitted development rights.

It should be noted that although there is significant overlooking as existing from the rear of the application site towards the garden and house of no. 1 Lower Drive the proposed extension will not result in any actual increased overlooking. The amended plans show the first floor window to the rear to be obscurely glazed and non openable except for over 1.7 metres.

Recommendation

REFUSE

The proposed side extension is unacceptable in that it results in a development which would be significantly detrimental to the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent property No. 1 Lower Drive. The extension, due to its height, massing and close proximity would be excessively overbearing and oppressive and worsen the existing overshadowing effect to an unacceptable extent. It is therefore contrary to saved Policy AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan and the Council's SPG 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

Informative

1. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to resolve those matters within the timescale allocated for the determination of this planning application. However, the Local Planning Authority has clearly set out, within its report, the steps necessary to remedy the harm identified within the reasons for refusal - which may lead to the submission of a more acceptable proposal in the future. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

1. For avoidance of doubt this refusal relates to the following drawings/plans:-
   Drawing no. ADC750/05 Rev B – received 4th Aug 2015
   Drawing no. ADC750/06 – received 4th Aug 2015
   Drawing no. ADC750/BP Rev Areceived 18th Aug 2015
   Drawing no. ADC750/LP – received 5th June 2015
   Drawing no. ADC750/04 Rev B – received 4th Aug 2015
   Drawing no. ADC750/07 – received 5th June

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 1st September 2015

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 01.09.2015