Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0832/18 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 16 Mill Lane, Shoreham-by-Sea, BN43 5AG

Proposal: Proposed single storey side and rear extension.

Date of site visit: 29.06.2018

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposal:

The application property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling, with an existing vehicular access, drive, and a detached garage at the end of the drive, set close to the outside rear corner of the dwellinghouse, and positioned close to the boundary with the neighbouring property, no. 18. It has a similar sized front and rear garden, i.e. each approx. 13m long.

The property has a single storey rear extension with a hipped roof. The fencing to no. 18 and enclosing the rear garden, is approx. 2 high. No. 18 also has a rear extension.

The proposal seeks permission to provide a single storey wrap around extension - across the full width of the rear (approx. 9.2m wide) and along the side elevation measuring approx. 10.6m long. The width of the side extension will be approx. 2m

The side extension will be onto the boundary with the neighbouring property no. 18 and the side extension would be approx. 1m off the boundary with no. 14.

The depth of the rear extension would be approx. 3.6m, and its height will be approx. 3.8m

Relevant Planning History:

No. 18 Mill Lane
SU/88/99/TP Additional storey (with hipped roof) above garage and single storey side extension to living room. **Approved 19.07.1999**

Representations: None received

Relevant Planning Policies
Adur Local Plan 2017: Policy 15
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2018)
National Planning Practice Guidance 2018

Planning Assessment

Development is acceptable in principle subject to the residential and visual amenities of the area.

Visual Amenity

The dwelling seeks permission to extend across the full width and to the side of the existing dwelling. The extension will leave a gap of approx. 1m to the side boundary with no. 14 and it will remove the existing garage which is onto the boundary with no. 14. The built form of no. 14 will be approx. 1.5m to the side boundary with the application site.

No. 18 to the north west, has constructed a rear extension which comes up to approx. 2.2m from the side boundary, and that extension then continues further out than the side of their property to be approx.1m from the side boundary with no. 20. That extension forms a garage. Their property is wider than the application site, which means there is adequate distance to construct such a wide extension.

In view of the fact that no. 18 has a rear window in close proximity to the proposal, the extension has been amended to include a 'dog leg', which effectively means that the outside corner closest to no. 18 will be slightly reduced. The reduced distance will minimize its impact onto the neighbouring window, which prevents it causing unacceptable overbearing or overshadowing onto that property.

Residential Amenity

The neighbouring properties that could be affected by the proposal are no.'s 14 to the south east and no. 18 to the north west.

No. 14 has a gap of approx. 1.5m to the side boundary with the application site which itself has a gap of approx. 1m to the side boundary, thereby creating a gap of approx. 2.5m between the two properties. There is a wall on the boundary to no. 14 which is approx. 1.8m high. No. 14 has a rear conservatory and ground floor side windows, but because of the wall direct overlooking is largely avoided. Further as the extension is single storey and because the majority is within the side of the existing dwelling, there is a limited amount of extension that could cause overshadowing to no. 14 indeed, the proposal is only some 1.4m deeper than the existing extension, and it is not considered that this would cause unacceptable overshadowing onto no. 14 as it would, in any case, be to the rear of their existing conservatory.

The attached dwelling no. 18 could be affected by the proposal at no. 16, given that the extension will come up to the boundary with that property, and they have a rear window near the boundary. But by dog legging the extension at the corner, it minimizes its potential impact onto that property by way of overshadowing and overlooking. It is thereby considered that it would not result in unacceptable harm onto that property.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved plans
2. Standard time limit
3. Materials to match existing
4. No windows on either side of the proposed extension

Informative

1. Approved following amendments

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 08.10.2018

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 9 October 2018