DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

Application No: AWDM/0760/11	Recommendation – Approve
Site	36 Kings Walk Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5LG
Proposal:	Demolition of existing detached garage and rebuilding an attached garage

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS: N

PROPOSAL, SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application property comprises a 2-storey detached house overlooking the beach, on the north side of Kings Walk. It has previously been enlarged by front and rear extensions.

Permission is sought to demolish the existing detached garage which is set back into the rear garden and replace it with a larger garage with a ridged roof roughly in the same position, but positioned slightly further forward. It would be 7.8m long and 3.3m wide attached to the north-east corner of the existing dwelling. The east flank of the garage would abut the boundary with No.37. The eaves would overhang the boundary (Certificate B has been completed). The external finish would consist of render except the east side which would be brickwork. The roof will be tiled with 2 velux roof lights inserted on the west slope (facing the garden).

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

ADC/297/08 – First-floor rear extension and enlarged hipped roof with rooms in roof – permitted July 2008
SU/149/01/TP – Single-storey rear extension – permitted August 2001
SU/9/83/TP – Single-storey extension at front with roof terrace – permitted March 1983.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

Saved Adur District Local Plan: AG1, AH7
South East Plan: CC6, BE1

RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES/REPRESENTATIONS

No third party representations.

The EHO recommends a precautionary condition relating to the handling of possible contamination.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

The proposal constitutes improvement of the existing housing stock and can be supported in principle. The relevant considerations are the effects on the visual and residential amenities of the locality.

The effects on the appearance of the dwelling and surrounding streetscene

The garage is larger than the existing garage with the front roof gable some 0.9m higher than the existing shallow mono-pitched roof. The apex of the roof is not centred above the garage door which results in a slightly uncomfortable appearance. However, the garage building would be set back some 20m from the edge of the highway and would not be a prominent feature within the streetscene.

The effect on the residential amenities of neighbour occupiers

The garage would enclose the neighbour's garden on the east side, being longer and taller than the existing garage (although the eaves height of the proposed garage is only marginally higher than the front part of the existing garage).

There are some external spiral steps (leading to patio doors in the first-floor rear elevation) in the rear of No.37 adjacent to the front part of the proposed garage. Daylighting to the nearest ground floor window in the rear of 37 is already affected by the existing garage at No.36 and also by the metal staircase above. The proposed garage would have *some* additional impact on daylight and overshadowing of this nearest part of No.37, and would increase the sense of enclosure, but the effect compared to the existing situation would not be so severe as to warrant refusal on this ground.

It is noted that there are a number of large domestic outbuildings/garages in the rear gardens of nearby properties, including a detached garage on the east side of the rear garden of No.37.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE

REASON FOR APPROVAL

The proposed garage building would not detract from the appearance of the dwelling or the character of the built environment generally and can take place without significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers. The proposed development does not therefore conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) or the policies of the South East Plan (CC!, CC6, BE1).

Subject to:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Materials to comprise render and brickwork to match
4. No new windows in side walls of garage other than approved

Informative: Actions re. potential contamination

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?

No

DELEGATED

Case Officer Sign..... [redacted] .....Date 18·11·11

Authorising Officer Sign..... [redacted] .....Date 18/11/11