Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1026/15 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 71 King George Road, Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex

Proposal: Part single part two storey rear extension to east elevation.

Date of site visit: 3.08.15

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is located within Shoreham-By-Sea, a semi-detached, two storey dwelling within a street of similar properties. The surrounding locality comprises of residential dwellings. The property is set back from the street with a deep frontage comprising of garden area and driveway. There is an existing conservatory to the rear.

The proposal seeks planning permission for a part two storey and part single storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling. It is proposed that the existing conservatory is to be removed and a single storey extension is proposed the full width of the house to a depth of 3 metres. Above part of the ground floor extension a first floor addition is proposed. This element is 3.6 metres wide and 3 metres deep. A hipped roof is proposed to a maximum height of 6.4 metres. The extension will provide an enlarged kitchen at ground floor and an additional bedroom at first floor.

Consultations: Southern Water: - Advice is given that the development lies over a presumably public sewer. The applicant is advised to discuss the matter further with Southern Water. Should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its condition, the number of properties served and potential means of access before any further works commence on site.

Representations: no objections have been received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted 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’
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012).

Planning Assessment

Principle

There is no objection in principle to the proposed development which involves an extension to an existing dwelling house. However the issues for consideration here are the impact of the proposed development on the visual amenity of the locality, street scene and existing dwelling and the impact upon the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings.

Visual amenity

The proposed extensions are to the rear of the dwelling, the ridge of the extension is lower than the main ridge and is therefore the proposed roof of the extension will not be a bulky feature within the street scene or in relation to the existing dwelling. The depth of the ground and first floor additions are not considered to be excessive and are subservient to the main dwelling. The ground floor extension will partly replace the existing conservatory also. Ample rear garden space will remain.

The extension will be rendered to match the existing dwelling with tiles to match the roof.

Residential amenity

The ground floor extension abuts the boundary with the attached dwelling to the north. As existing this adjacent dwelling has a rear conservatory the full width of the property which appears to be greater than 3 metres in depth. There are no side windows proposed on both the ground and first floor extension which will overlook the attached adjacent dwelling. There will be some loss of light potentially to the existing conservatory however this is not considered to be significant in the light of the existing adjacent conservatory. The first floor extension is set in away from the boundary by 2.7 metres however it is to the south of the neighbouring property. Yet on balance any loss of light would not warrant a refusal in this case. It should be noted that no. 69 adjacent has an unusual situation where the existing conservatory is across the rear of the original house with the original external wall still remaining, with two windows serving the kitchen. The presence of the conservatory removes light from the kitchen and this area receives limited light. Although some loss of light may occur due to the extension adjacent, the light to the original kitchen would not be significantly affected. The light to the kitchen has already been reduced by the existing conservatory across the rear of the dwelling.

Due to the depth of the first floor extension being limited to 3 metres and its set in from the boundary it is considered that there will not be any significant loss of light or overbearing impact in this case. The Council's adopted Development Control Standard no. 3 makes reference to first floor extensions within 1 metre of the boundary not exceeding 2 metres in depth. In this case there is 2.7 metres to the boundary and the extension is 3 metres in depth. It is not considered that there will be any adverse impact with regards to loss of light or overbearing impact to the adjacent bedroom window at no. 69.

As stated above no windows are proposed on the side of the extensions, the main aspect is to the rear, east. A condition is attached to ensure that no openings can be formed in the side elevations to limit any potential over looking.

It should be noted that although no formal objection was received from the adjacent neighbour, the case officer did visit their property and discuss the process with them to allow a full assessment to be made.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. 3 year time limit
2. Materials to match existing
3. Approved plans
4. No openings on north or south side of proposed extensions.

Informative

1. Proactive informative
2. Southern Water informative

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 18th August 2015

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 18.08.2015