Development Management– Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1891/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 87 Old Shoreham Road, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Single storey rear extension to south west elevation

Date of site visit: 23.1.2017

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposal

The application relates to a two-storey, mid-terrace property. There are two single-storey extensions, flat and lean-to, attached to the rear of the building adjacent to the south eastern boundary. There is also a very shallow projection on the north western boundary. These additions and extensions are to be removed. A single storey flat roof extension is proposed the full width of the dwelling. Two roof lanterns are proposed with the extension providing a kitchen dining space. The extension is proposed at 4 metres in depth, 5.4 metres wide and 3.2 metres high to the flat roof and 3.7 metres high to the highest point of the roof lantern.

The site is located within Flood Zone 3 and a Householder FRA has been submitted in accordance with EA Standing Advice.

Consultations: None

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
Adur Submission Local Plan Policy 15.
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extension which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The proposed extension is to the rear of the property. It is not visible within the street scene. The dwellings either side of the site also have rear extensions. The dwelling has a long rear garden. The extension is modest in scale, simple in form and design. It is subservient to the main dwelling.

Residential Amenity

The main dwellings to be affected are those attached to the dwelling to the south east and north west, nos. 85 and 87 respectively. No 85 has an existing extension brick built with lean to glazed roof the full width of the dwelling. Where this extension abuts the boundary there is a solid wall. This as existing abuts the existing extension at the application site. Part of the side wall at the application site is to be used to form the side wall of the proposed extension. This will abut the solid wall at no. 85 yet the new extension will extend further to the rear up to 4 metres in depth. The Council's Development Control Standards refers to extensions being limited to 3.5 metres in depth where they are adjacent to attached dwellings. Yet in this case the existing extension at no. 85 will limit any adverse impact and screen the majority of the extension. It is therefore considered that the addition depth of 0.5 metres will be acceptable here. A condition is attached to ensure that no openings are formed in the side elevations of the proposed extension.

To the north- west is no. 89 which has an existing single storey extension built up to the boundary with balcony above. The proposed extension will abut the side wall of this extension at no. 89. As with the neighbour property discussed above the depth of the extension at 4 metres is permitted in this case due to the impact upon adjacent neighbouring properties being mitigated by the existing extension. The existence of the balcony on the boundary with no privacy screen is unusual yet the proposed extension may allow for increased separation and privacy in this case. However it is noted that the plans show two roof lanterns. It is possible that the roof lantern nearest to no. 89 may give rise to some mutual overlooking if the balcony is in use. It may be possible for anyone using the balcony to look through into the living space below. It is not considered that a condition is warranted here to require that this lantern is obscurely glazed as it may be the desire of the applicant to have this clearly glazed or the neighbour may choose to install a privacy screen. Yet an informative is attached to bring this matter to the attention of the applicant.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. standard time limit
2. no openings other than those approved on side elevations.
3. approved plans
4. Matching materials
5. Development to be carried out in accordance with submitted FRA

Informative

1. Proactive no amendments

2. The applicant is advised that to avoid any potential overlooking between the adjacent balcony and the extension hereby permitted that consideration should be given to whether it is necessary or desirable to obscurely glaze the roof lantern adjacent to no. 89 to avoid any possibility of overlooking in this case.

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 30.01.2017

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 31.01.2017