Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1347/17 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 9 Cissbury Way, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Two-storey side extension to west elevation with associated ground works.

Date of site visit: 4 October 2017

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to an end of terrace two storey dwelling on the north side of Cissbury Way. The site fronts a grass amenity area with no vehicular access. There is a similar terrace on the opposite side of the wide grass strip and the land rises up from the east so that all the houses have stepped ridge heights.

It is proposed to construct a two storey extension to the west side of No. 9 measuring 4m wide. It will be set back 0.4m from the front wall of the existing house and will have a reduced ridge height. It will be 0.3m off the western boundary, beyond which is the rear garden of bungalows in Mill Hill Drive. A new retaining wall is to be constructed on the west side due to the higher ground level.

Relevant site history

None

Consultations

None

Representations

None received

Relevant Planning Policies

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’
Submission Adur Local Plan (2016) Policy 15
National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

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

The extension will be quite wide, almost doubling the width of the original house and leaving only 0.3m to the boundary. However, it will be set back and have a lower ridge.

It is considered that, in this case, no visual harm would be caused by the extension. It is at the end of the terrace furthest from the road and is not widely visible. The retention of a gap of 1m to the boundary is not necessary here as there are no buildings immediately to the west.

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in visual terms.

Residential amenity

The extension will close the gap to the rear boundary with 20 Mill Hill Drive to the west. That property has a large outbuilding in the rear garden and a distance of approximately 19m will be retained between the rear of No.20 and the side of No.9 which is acceptable. No windows are proposed at the side of the extension and the proposal is not considered to result in a loss of residential amenity.

The extension is offset from No.8 on the opposite side of the terrace and is over 20m away. There is a garage compound and turning head at the rear of the site.

The extension has an internal link to the original house on the ground floor only and, in view of its size, it is considered necessary to impose a condition requiring the extension to be occupied in connection with the main house only.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials to match existing
4. Not to be occupied separately
5. No side windows

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

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.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 4 October 2017

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 5 October 2017