Application Number: ADC/0307/10 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 340 Upper Shoreham Road, Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 5QE

Proposal: Two-storey extension on north side



© Crown copyright. All rights reserved. 100018844. (2010)

The Application

The property is a detached mock-Tudor style house situated on the west side of the junction of The Driveway with Upper Shoreham Road. Although the address is Upper Shoreham Road, the house fronts The Driveway. The main garden area is on the north side of the house and there are trees and shrubs in the front garden.

There is an existing 'catslide' roof on the north side of the house with an integral garage. Permission is sought to extend the building on the north side, replacing the catslide roof with a full two-storey extension with hipped roof. The extension is the full depth of the house. The extension will provide a utility and garden room at ground floor and a master bedroom and ensuite at first floor.

Since its submission, amended plans have been received reducing the bulk of the proposed first floor and roof. The building is still to be extended northwards by 1.4 metres on the ground floor but the first floor has been reduced by 0.5m and is now proposed to be extended northwards by 1.5m-5m. The roof has also correspondingly been reduced in length by 0.5m and for the most part has been lowered to 1m below the existing ridge line, with a ridge height of 7.2m as compared to 8.2m originally.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: Letters have been received from residents of 2 properties.

The residents of No.342 Upper Shoreham Road, the neighbouring property to the west, state that they would have no objection to a single-storey extension but believe the proposed extension would dramatically reduce light and compromise the enjoyment of their garden. On the amended plans, they still consider the first-floor part of the extension, although reduced, would be overbearing and oppressive and greatly reduce light to their living room. They also comment that the proposed north bedroom window would overlook the rear of their garden. They add that the proposal exceeds the unwritten '45 degree rule' by some 35-40%.

The residents of No.2 The Driveway, opposite to the east, have no objection.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2005 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No. 3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.'
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development'

Planning Assessment

Policies

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 unacceptable loss of light or privacy or have an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings and be sympathetic to the original dwelling in design and materials. Supplementary Planning Guidance is contained in DC Standard No. 3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'. The latter does not contain any specific dimensional limitations for extensions to detached houses.

Government policy is set out in Planning Policy Statement PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development'. Relevant paragraphs are 17, which refers to the commitment to protecting and improving the environment; 18 which states that planning should seek to maintain and improve the local environment and help to mitigate the effects of declining environmental quality through positive policies on issues such as design; and 34 which states that good design is indivisible from good planning and that design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area, should not be acceptable.

Residential Amenity

The property most affected by the proposed development is the detached house No.342 Upper Shoreham Road, to the west of the site. The applicant's house is built close to the boundary with No.342 and already projects about 4m further to the north/rear. No.342 has an existing detached flat-roofed garage adjacent to the common boundary and this would screen the ground floor part of the proposed extension. However, the first floor part of the extension would be clearly visible from the rear garden and from the rear lounge window/patio doors of No.342.

The proposed extension would extend 5m to the north of the existing rear wall of No.342 and, because it is a full two storeys plus hipped roof as compared to the existing ‘catslide’ roof (which slopes down to single-storey height), it would add considerable bulk.

However, there is a reasonable gap of 3m between the houses and it is considered that there is scope for a two-storey extension, preferably both lower and shorter. Some form of ‘catslide’ would have still been desirable to achieve a lower rear eaves line and retain something of the character of the existing house. Negotiations took place and the applicant agreed to reduce the length slightly and also lower the ridge but not the rear eaves line.

On balance, it is considered that the proposed extension as amended is acceptable. Given that the extension is to the north east, the degree of sun and daylight reduction to the rear of No.342 is not considered to be so serious as to warrant refusal. The reduction in depth and height from that originally submitted has reduced the bulk, making it less overbearing and the relationship, on balance, is now felt to be satisfactory. The proposed rear bedroom window would only obliquely provide a view over part of the rear garden of No.342 and is acceptable.

There is a distance of 17m between the proposed first-floor bedroom window and the south side windows of No.1 The Driveway, to the north of the site There is some vegetation which would screen the extension and the proposal is not considered to result in any significant overlooking or loss of privacy.

Visual Amenity

The proposed extension would upset the proportions of the existing house, replacing the distinctive ‘catslide’ roof with a full two storeys. However, it is not considered that refusal is warranted. There is some screening to the front of the site and the design detailing of the extension respects that of the existing house. There would be no significant adverse impact on the streetscene or surrounding built environment.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7)

Subject to:-

1. C1Ci (Standard time limit)
2. C12Ei (Materials to match existing, including windows) (amended)
3. C18Eiv (No windows in west side without permission)
4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings:-
   Drawing no. 907/05 Rev A – received 5 October 2010
   Drawing no. 907/03 Rev A – received 5 October 2010
   Drawing no. 907/02 Rev A – received 5 October 2010.

.....