Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1653/19 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 344 Upper Shoreham Road, Shoreham-by-Sea, BN43 5QE

Proposal: Proposed single storey extension to south elevation, including raising of garage roof height.

Date of site visit: 18.03.2020

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings & Proposal

The application relates to a 2 storey, gable fronted, detached dwelling, situated on the north side of Upper Shoreham Road. There is an existing garage positioned on the east side of the dwelling which appears to be up to the boundary with the neighbouring property no. 342.

The street is characterised by predominantly detached and semi-detached dwellings of varying designs.

The application seeks permission to extend the existing garage forward to be approx. 1.1m back from the front elevation. Like the existing garage, the extension will also be flat roofed. The extension will measure approx. 5.7m long x 2.6m wide x 2.9m high, and will be to the side boundary with no. 342 Upper Shoreham Road.

There will also be some changes to the existing fenestration on the west elevation i.e. the bricking up of the existing kitchen side door; the bricking up of the pantry window; and the change from the door off of the living room to a side window.

Planning History: None

Consultations: None

Representations: Objection from 342 Upper Shoreham Road

- The wall of the new structure will be at least 3m high. The distance from our property is approximately 1.1m at the existing building and will taper to 1.0m. At the most Southerly point it will be just 0.5m. We believe the structure would be too close to the front of the houses and undoubtedly, (when viewed from the road), give the appearance of the properties being joined. Not a valid point under today's planning rules but certainly an architectural issue.

- There are existing windows to the West side of our property which will face the proposed extension. They both serve habitable rooms.
  Firstly, our kitchen/breakfast room will most certainly be affected. We understand that planning departments use a 45/25 degree rule to help them make judgment in cases such as this. If applied it would most certainly not comply in both horizontal and vertical aspects.
  The second window is in the living room and although relatively small, spreads light to the back of the room. We believe the degree rule would apply here too.
- We have lived at this property since 1991 and understand that after that period of time there is a rule that guarantees us the right to light from such windows
- Although not planning issues we would like to draw attention to the very close proximity of gas and water facilities on our property but perhaps more importantly, the foul water manhole and pipe work which are situated only centimetres from the proposed construction. There is a manhole giving access to the main sewer running behind all properties, positioned exactly on the north corner of the garage. The sewer pipe at that point is about a metre deep. There is also a sewer pipe running diagonally under the current garage floor.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 1, 15
DM Standard No.2 SPG - Extensions and alterations to dwellings
National Planning Policy Framework (2019)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

Principle

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extension which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area.

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 & Residential Amenity

Although coming further forward than the existing garage, it will be stepped back from the front elevation and will have a subsidiary appearance, in accordance with the Council's advice in DM Standard No.2. Being single storey it will maintain the existing visual gap between neighbouring buildings at first floor level.

Therefore in visual terms the side garage extension will be acceptable from the street.

However, as it will be onto the side boundary with its immediate neighbour no. 342 Upper Shoreham Road, it will be directly viewed from their side.

The west side elevation of their property is approx. 1.5m from the boundary and there are windows on that elevation. Towards the front of the side elevation there is a small window which is a secondary window serving the front living room, this window is also constructed by using obscured and coloured glass, but as it is a secondary window and not a principal window it is not taken to be a material consideration with regards to the neighbours' amenity.

A further small window to the south side of the chimney breast is also obscure glazed and from correspondence received, it is understood that this window serves a kitchen/breakfast room. This window is behind a high fence and so light would be diffused to that room, the proposed extension was to be brick, which would have cause some loss of light to that room, however the plans have now been amended and the side elevation of the extension will now be white render which will give some reflected light to that room, and is thereby considered acceptable.

One other consideration with regard to light and shadowing to the neighbouring property, is the fact that the side, flank elevation of no. 344 exists next to the neighbouring property no. 342, this flank elevation thereby already minimizes light from the west to no. 342, and although the proposed extension will bring the elevation closer to no. 342 in single storey form, it is not considered that the resultant loss of light will be materially greater than what currently exists.

Right to light legislation is different from planning legislation. Although light is a consideration of planning applications, it is considered that it has been covered above. The gas, water, and sewer pipes are also not material planning considerations; such matters would be covered by others.

It is not considered that the proposed side extension, with white render side wall, would materially result in a loss of residential or visual amenities to the neighbouring property.

With regard to the fenestration changes to the west side of the dwelling, it is considered that these will not result in unacceptable harm onto the neighbouring property no. 346.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to the following conditions.

1. Approved plans
2. Standard time limit
3. Materials to side wall to be white render
4. No windows on side elevation

Informative
1. Approved following revision

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

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 18.05.2020

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 18 May 2020