Expiry Date – 13/3

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0073/19 Recommendation – Grant

Site: 20a Windlesham Gardens, Shoreham

Proposal: Single storey (East) rear extension, first floor (South) side/rear extension; timber cladding to East and West elevations, green roof to existing front ground floor games room and garage

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 12.2

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a 1960's detached house on the east side of Windlesham Gardens. The house is a typical gabled house but with a glazed side addition with catslide roof. It also has two flat roofed single storey front additions, one a garage, the other converted into a living room.

The property is generally untypical in the street as it is a more modern infill. To the south, No. 20, is a more substantial Edwardian detached house. To the north is a double fronted office building occupied by the National Federation of Postmasters.

The property is not in a conservation area and is not a listed building.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a recessed first floor extension behind the catslide roof to provide additional headroom to an existing bedroom and to create room for an en-suite bathroom. The front elevation of this extension is to be timber clad. The existing tile hanging on the front and rear elevations are also to be replaced in timber cladding. Also proposed is a 2.7 metre deep single storey rear extension with mono pitched roof. Finally the two existing flat roofed front additions are to have replacement 'green' sedum roofs.

Relevant Planning History

SU/52/68 – House and garage. Granted.

Consultations

None undertaken.

Representations

Objection received from No. 20 summarised as follows:

1. The new window to bedroom 2 will result in a loss of privacy and will overlook the main sitting out area of our garden. It is much larger than the existing window, 93% bigger. It will be sited closer to our boundary and have a higher cill level. It will result in significant loss of privacy affecting our rights to the quiet enjoyment of our garden. We had sight of a plan with a smaller window before this application was submitted.

2. A conifer in the garden of 20a, which currently provides screening will have to be removed to enable the ground floor extension to be built. This will exacerbate the loss of privacy.

3. We object to the plans as presented and would urge the Council to consider its responsibilities under the Human Rights Act in particular Protocol 1, Article 1, which states that a person has a right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions which includes the home and other land. Further, Article 8 of the Human Rights Act states that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2019
Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and 15 including 'Development Management Standard No. 2 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development can be supported as it upgrades a dwelling within the built up area boundary. For consideration is the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area and the impacts of the development on neighbour amenity.

Neighbour amenity

The green sedum roofs will have no neighbour impact.

No. 20 has a single storey rear extension 0.5 metre less deep than the existing rear wall at 20a. The proposed extension at 2.7 metres deep will in effect extend 3.2 metres beyond the rear wall of No. 20. It is set in from the common boundary by 1.6 metres and has a maximum ridge height of 3.4 metres. No. 22 has a single storey rear extension to a similar depth. This extension will not be harmful.

The first floor extension proposed does not extend beyond the main rear wall and is recessed from the front catslide by 2.1 metres. It lifts the eaves height by 1.5 metres but does not extend to the full existing ridge height. It will not cause significant harm to No. 20. An en-suite side window will be obscurely glazed and non-opening below 1.7 metres.

The development facilitates increased head height in an existing bedroom under the catslide roof. The existing bedroom window is to be replaced with a wider and taller window with a higher cill level.

There is already overlooking from the existing bedroom window. The new window will be closer to the common boundary. It is also likely that a large shrub in the site's garden on the boundary will be removed to facilitate the ground floor extension. This will open up the possible views in No.20's garden further.

The applicant was asked to reconsider a smaller window and perhaps the addition of a rooflight as compensation. This was declined.

Notwithstanding this request, it is not considered that the extent of additional overlooking that will result is sufficiently harmful to justify withholding planning permission. An element of overlooking is to be expected in an urban setting and does exist to some extent already. The neighbours at No. 20 can enhance screening within their own garden if they consider it to be necessary once the extension is built.

Visual amenity/Character.

This house is unlike any other in the street. The catslide feature of the roof will be retained in part. A lower gabled extension will complement the existing gable. It is not considered that harm to visual amenity or wider character will result. Timber cladding of the proposed and in replacement of the existing tile hanging is an acceptable alteration too as this is an untypical property in the street.

Recommendation APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved Plans
2. 3 years
3. Materials to match, other than the timber cladding
4. No new windows side walls.
5. En-suite bathroom window fixed below 1.7 m and obscure.

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? Yes.

Case Officer signed: MOK Date: 12.3.19

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 12 March 2019