Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0359/25 Recommendation: Refuse

Site: 14 Upper Kingston Lane, Southwick

Proposal: Proposed rear dormer and first floor extension over existing ground floor

Date of Site Visit: 28 April 2025

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional neighbour notification: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings:

The application relates to a semi detached chalet bungalow on the east side of Upper Kingston Lane. It has a rear dormer low down on the roofslope which is shared with its neighbour and a flat roofed ground floor extension. It is one of three pairs of identical dwellings in a run on this side of the street. The land rises from south to north such that No. 14 is on higher ground than the neighbouring property to the south (No.12).

It is proposed to construct a first floor flat roofed extension across approximately half the width of the existing rear extension. It is also proposed to construct a dormer extension both above and to the south side of the existing dormer, taking up most of the roofslope.

Planning History:

AWDM/0049/14 - Householder application for permitted development for prior approval for single storey rear extension measuring 4m from rear wall of the original dwelling, maximum height 3.5m and maximum height of eaves 2.5m.

Consultations:

None

Representations

Letter of objection received from the occupiers of 12 Upper Kingston Lane:

- Loss of light

- Eyesore
- Loss of privacy

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

Planning Assessment

Principle

The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Visual amenity

The proposed extensions are considered to be unsympathetic and dominant additions to the rear of this chalet bungalow. The dormer extension would completely overwhelm the rear roofslope leaving little of the original roofslope visible, contrary to advice in DM Standard No. 2. Its impact would be exacerbated by it linking to the proposed first floor extension which in itself is considered to be an unsympathetic addition to a property such as this which has a low eaves line. At 4.2m deep and 5.4m high it would be a bulky addition which would not respect the form and character of the existing building. Overall, the development is considered to be unsightly and harmful to the character of the property.

Residential amenity

The roof extension would introduce second floor windows which would allow for views of neighbouring gardens. However, it is not considered that the level of overlooking would be so unusual or excessive as to warrant refusal.

The first floor extension is set off the boundary with the attached house to the north by approximately 3m. That property has not been extended and, being to the north of No.14, combined with the depth of the extension, it is likely to suffer some loss of daylight and sunlight. The house to the south, while not losing sunlight, is on lower ground and is likely to be adversely affected by the overbearing nature of the extension.

The proposal is therefore harmful to residential amenity.

Recommendation

REFUSE

For the following reason:-

1. The proposed extensions, by reason of their height, bulk and scale, would be dominant and overbearing additions which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the original property and which would cause a loss of light and have an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties, resulting in a loss of residential amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, Development Management Standard No.2 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings and the NPPF.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation N

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 29 May 2025

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 29/05/2025