Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1164/18 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 7 Beach Green, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Two storey side extension to east elevation, including first floor extension above existing garage and extension of garage to front.

Date of site visit: 2nd October 2018

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a large detached dwelling within a street of properties of varying style and appearance. As existing there is a flat roof garage attached to the east side of the two storey dwelling. As originally submitted consent was sought for a two storey side extension incorporating the ground floor garage. The house was to be extended to the side in line with the rear of the house. There was to be a slight set in to the front of the house at first floor level and a single storey front projection with lean to tiled roof. The extension will provide an extended living room at ground floor with utility and garage and two bedrooms and a bathroom at first floor.

Following the case officer's site visit it was considered that the side extension was overly large and should be reduced in width. It was also considered that the ground floor front projection added to the bulk of the extension and there should be a set back to the extension rather than a projection to allow the extension to appear subservient and subordinate.

Amended plans have been received; however these only show a reduction in width of the extension at first floor with the addition of a tiled lean to roof continuing around the side of the building at ground floor. The application is to be considered in the light of these amended plans.

Consultations

Adur and Worthing Councils: Environmental Health – Contaminated Land - Precautionary land contamination conditions and PFA informative recommended.

Representations

1 email representation received from the owner/occupier of no. 5 Beach Green – The application will result in a loss of light to the room and upstairs of our house and a loss of view. We wondered whether the upstairs wall could be sloped perhaps or slightly further away from our property to reduce the loss of light and view.

1 email representation from, owner/occupier of 116 Old Fort Road stating that the plan shows an increase in number of bedrooms but does not show any changes in parking facilities.

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 (July 2018)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

As stated above the property is within a street of properties of varying style and appearance. The initial concern in this case was with the scale of the proposed side extension in relation to the main dwelling and whether it represented a subservient development here. As amended the plans show a first floor set in, although the front projection has not been removed. On balance it is considered that visually the ground floor side lean to tiled roof and first floor set it does give rise to an improvement here. Although still large in width the extension appears more subordinate. There is also a distance in excess of 1 metre to the boundary and over 2 metres between the side of the proposed first floor addition and the adjacent dwelling to the east. Therefore sufficient spacing exists between the buildings, avoiding a cramped appearance.

Although the front projection has not been removed, on balance, taking into consideration the variation in the street scene and that the first floor addition is set back and has a lower ridge height, it is considered that a refusal could not be justified here in terms of character and visual amenity.

Residential amenity

The main property to be affected is to property to the east, no. 5. An objection has been received stating that there will be a loss of light and loss of view to the existing side window. Consideration was given here to the impact with regards to loss of light as loss of view is not a planning consideration. The set in at first floor will reduce the impact here and there is in excess of 2 metres between the proposed first floor extension and the neighbouring window. The window serves a bedroom and the front window, although smaller also serves the same room. On balance it is considered that, while there will be some loss of light here, it would not be so significant as to warrant a refusal here. There is also aspect and outlook to the

front/north and there is spacing between the properties which will remain. Also the impact being on a bedroom and not a main living area is a consideration here in favour of the proposal.

The side elevation of the new extension has no openings other than a ground floor side door. It is considered this this door should be obscurely glazed to avoid any loss of privacy to the adjacent property. A condition is also attached to ensure that no further openings are added to the side elevation.

In the light of the scale of the development, informatives relating to contaminated land are suitable in this case.

The issue of parking raised by the objector is not considered to be of concern here. There is off street parking to the front of the property for at least 2 cars and the garage is to remain. The proposal would not give rise to any highway safety concerns in this case.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials to match existing
4. No additional windows on the east elevation of the extension the ground floor door shall be obscurely glazed.

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

1. Proactive with amendments

2. PFA Informative

3. Precautionary contaminated land informative

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 15th January 2019

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 15 January 2019