expires 25/12/06

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0405/06 **Recommendation - Permit**

Site: **31 Rosslyn Road Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 6WL**

Proposal: **Two-storey rear extension**

The Application

The application property comprises an unusual L-shaped house occupying a corner plot at the junction of Rosslyn Road and Rosslyn Court. Permission is sought for a 2-storey rear extension 5m deep and 4.7m wide on the east side of the rear elevation. The extension would have a hipped roof extending north from the existing ridge by 5m. The additional accommodation would consist of a day room plus utility room on the ground floor and 2 bedrooms and en-suite toilet on the first floor.

Planning permission was refused in 2004 (SU/180/04) for the enlargement and conversion of this dwelling to provide 5 flats (involving side and rear extensions and an enlarged & higher roof with dormers). A subsequent appeal was dismissed in June 2005. The Inspector having concerns that the substantial extensions proposed would "overpower" the adjacent bungalow (No.29) and would appear overlarge, cramped and not in keeping with the modest suburban character and appearance of the area. He also considered the proposed rear extension would dominate the rear garden of No.29 and be overbearing to its occupant; would cause extensive overshadowing to the rear garden of No.29 during the morning (considered unacceptable given the northern aspect) and that the cumulative impact of the proposed rear and front extensions and modified roof would reduce the amount of daylight to 29.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties

2 letters of objection have been received from the residents of 27 and 29 Rosslyn Road. The residents 29 Rosslyn Road point out that in refusing the earlier proposal the Inspector considered a 2-storey rear extension would over-dominate and overlook 29 with a loss of privacy. It is considered the current proposal is similarly unacceptable and should be refused for the same reasons. The resident of 27 considers the proposal to be an over-development and significant intensification in use of the existing dwelling; also the bulk and mass of the development is not in character with the environment of Rosslyn Road. He also comments that the extent of the rear extent would be overbearing and oppressive resulting in a claustrophobic effect at the rear of 27. The "menacing" effect of the wall could not be relieved by windows as this would lead to overlooking and a loss of privacy. Also reference is made

to the additional noise and light pollution resulting from additional occupiers and intensified use of the property.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adur District Local Plan (1996): AG1, AH7, AT12 Development Control Standard 3 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings"
West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (2004): LOC1, CH1, DEV1, DEV4-5
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

The main concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

The proposed extension has been designed to match the proportions of the existing fronting projecting element of this dwelling. It would, however, result in an extremely long flank wall some (17.7m long) adjacent to the east side boundary with Rosslyn Court. However, bearing in mind No.35 (on the opposite side of Rosslyn Court) has recently been extended by a 2-storey side and rear addition (albeit a wholly different design of dwelling), it is considered the extent of the flank wall would not appear unduly excessive or overbearing in the context of the surrounding streetscene. A rear garden depth of 9m would be retained to serve the enlarged house.

In terms of the impact on the adjoining chalet bungalow, 29 Rosslyn Road, the proposed rear extension would be set 2.3m in (east) of the existing west side wall of the rear element of 31. [The extension forming part of the earlier appeal was only 2m deep but aligned with the above-mentioned west side wall of the existing house.] Owing to its set back position the proposed extension would not be readily apparent in views from the rear of the bungalow and would not have an overbearing or oppressive effect on the accommodation of that property. It would, however, increase the sense of enclosure within the rear garden of No.29, projecting some 9m beyond the rear wall of the bungalow within approximately 3.4m of the common boundary as well as overshadowing the rear garden during the morning (as referred to in the earlier appeal decision). The tall shrubs and small trees growing within the curtilage of 29, alongside the common boundary, would provide some screening.

The main outlook from the proposed extension would be to the north. In dismissing the above-mentioned scheme the appeal Inspector noted the concerns about loss of privacy to the occupiers of 1 Rosslyn Court, but considered that this could be addressed by additional planting along the rear boundary. In any event, there would be a distance in excess of 22m between the rear (north) of the proposed extension in this case and the nearest part of Rosslyn Court, which is the minimum distance required in the above Standard to safeguard against adverse overlooking. As originally submitted, there was a 3 pane window at ground-floor in the west side of the extension (serving the day room) and a landing window at first-floor above. The above Standard

states there should be a minimum distance of 6.1m between a side window in a rear extension and any solid obstruction or the boundary. Following discussions the ground-floor window has been reduced in size to a 2 pane window and the drawings annotated to state that both windows would be obscurely-glazed.

On balance, it is considered the same weight cannot be attached to the effects of the proposed rear extension on the rear garden of 29 as would be attached to an impact on the living accommodation of this property. As such, it is considered the effect on the residential amenities of 29 would not be so serious as to warrant refusal on this ground.

Similarly, owing to the distance between them, it is considered the proposed extension would not have an oppressive or overbearing impact on the rear of No.27, or any serious enclosing effect on the rear garden of that property. Concerns about loss of privacy would be addressed by the requirement for obscure-glazing referred to above.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason: 1PPi

Subject to:

1. C1Ci
2. C12Ei
3. C14Ai "5 December 2006" R: AH7 of the ADLP and DEV1 of the WSSP
4. Notwithstanding the detail shown on the approved floor plan the ground-floor window in the west side wall of the two-storey rear extension serving the day room shall be no more than 1.2m wide as shown on the elevation drawing.
   R: For the avoidance of doubt.
5. C18Ci ".....windows in the west side wall.....etc."
6. C18Eii "west side"

Case Officer..... [redacted] ..... [redacted] 13/12

Date..... 8·12·06 .....

Head of Planning & Community.. [redacted] .

Date..... 13.12.06 .....

Chairman of P&R Committee..... [redacted] .....

Date..... 15/12/06 .....