Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/1503/13

Site: **8 Fishermans Walk**

Proposal: **Two storey side extension (resubmission of AWDM/0606/13)**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a two-storey side extension to measure (at max) 7.8 metres in height, 8.1 metres in length, and 2.9 metres in width.

The application property is an end of terrace two-storey property in a residential street in an outer suburb of Shoreham.

Relevant Planning History
AWDM/0606/13
Two storey side extension and replacement porch (existing garage removed).
Refused 25-07-2013 and appeal dismissed.

Consultations
None

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
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

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Visual amenity

This proposal is a resubmission following an earlier dismissed appeal on a refusal to grant planning permission due to the unacceptable visual impact of a proposed front extension. In this subsequent submission, that front extension has been omitted and a porch would be built under permitted development.

The dwellings within this terrace each have a large bow window at ground floor level and modest sized flat roofed front porches. Whilst the front and rear building lines of the terrace are staggered, the ridge and eaves heights of the terrace are consistent, as are the spacing and form of the fenestration.

The Council's Development Control Standard No.3 – *Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings* advises that extensions should normally be set back from the main front wall of the dwelling, to provide a visual break and to ensure the extension is subordinate to the main dwelling. However the flexibility in its wording reflects the need to consider each scheme on its individual merits. In this instance, due to the consistent building lines and roof lines of this part of the terrace, the form of the proposed side extension would be read as part of the original terrace and would be readily assimilated into the street scene.

The proposed first floor front window would be consistent with the adjacent two pane first floor window and the gap between these windows would respect that of other such gaps at first floor level within the terrace. As a result this aspect of the scheme would be seen as a logical continuation of the existing terrace and would blend in satisfactorily with both the host building and the terrace as a whole.

It is noted that the proposed first floor windows would not follow the rhythm of the first floor fenestration along the terrace, where two and three pane windows are alternated. However, the extension is located at the end of the terrace, where it would have a negligible impact on the rhythm and uniformity of the terrace as a whole. In addition, it is noted that first floor fenestration at No.1 Fisherman's Walk is almost identical to that proposed and it blends in appropriately with that dwelling and the street scene.

This assessment is in line with the reasoning of the Inspector at appeal when she assessed the merit of the two-storey extension then applied for.

Residential amenity – effect on existing dwellings

The proposed extension is physically removed from neighbouring buildings, so would not materially harm the residential amenities of their occupiers by way of adverse overshadowing and/or overbearing effect, or unacceptable loss of privacy/intrusive overlooking.

Flood Risk

The site falls within Flood Risk zone 3a, the highest category. However the proposal accords with Environment Agency standing advice in that the extension would be flood proofed by have the floor levels and door thresholds no lower than the existing building.

There would be no exacerbation of flood risk as a result, with no greater human health put at risk.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development can take place without detriment to the local environment. It would not result in any detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and consequently does not conflict with saved Adur Local Plan policies AG1, AH7 or the National Planning Policy Framework

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Materials and finishes to match

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? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 6-1-2014

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 9 January 2014