Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/0248/12

Site: 26 Juniper Walk, Shoreham By Sea

Proposal: Construction of a single storey extension to rear elevation

Date of site visit: 19 March 2012

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The site relates to a two storey semi detached house located on the south east side of Juniper Walk. The area is predominantly residential consisting of matching semi-detached houses in Juniper Walk.

The house has a garage within the rear garden and rear vehicular access, as does the connecting neighbour at No.25 to the east. It is proposed to construct a 3.9 metre deep single storey extension to the rear of the house which would connect to the existing garage structure. The southern corner of the extension would be chamfered and bi-fold doors installed to this corner.

No. 27, to the southwest, has a 3.6 metre (approx) deep single storey flat roof extension to the rear positioned within 1 metre of the common boundary. There are no extensions at No. 25 to the northeast.

Relevant site history
None relevant

Consultations
Adur & Worthing Councils: The Environmental Health Officer has recommended a precautionary contamination condition.

Representations

One letter of representation has been received from the occupier of the neighbouring property to the north east objecting to the proposal on the grounds of loss of light and outlook and increased sense of enclosure.

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’
South East Plan (GOSE 2009): CC1, CC6, BE1
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Visual amenity

The scale and proportions of the extension would be in keeping and the use of matching brickwork would help it blend with the recipient building. The applicant has agreed to a fibre glass roof to simulate lead.

Residential amenity

An amendment was requested to create a flat roof and to step the extension down to the lower ground level, but the applicant has not agreed to this.

The size and proximity of the neighbours extension at No. 27 would minimise the impact of the proposed extension on this side. Although the proposed bi-fold doors would face the boundary with No.27 at an oblique angle, given the presence of the neighbours extension and the 2 metre high (approx) boundary fencing, there would be no significant overlooking as a result of the position of these doors.

The main impact would therefore be to the occupiers of No. 25 to the north east. No. 25 and No.26 have a pair of garages within their respective gardens, set 3.9metres from the rear wall of both houses and opposite a dining room window at the rear of each house. The proposed extension at No. 26 would infill the gap between the rear wall of the house and the garage, effectively creating an enclosed garden area at the rear of No.25 with the side wall of the extension and the rear wall of the garage. The resultant impact would be increased overshadowing, loss of outlook and increased sense of enclosure and the comments made in the representation are noted. However, permitted development allowances would permit a 3 metre deep extension with an eaves height of 3 metres which, due to the existence of the garage only 3.9 metres from the rear wall of the house, would have a similarly overbearing effect. A reduction in the depth of the extension proposed in this application from 3.9 metres to 3 metres would not alleviate the issue due to the position of the garage. Therefore it is considered that given the permitted development fallback position, a refusal on residential amenity grounds cannot be justified.

The site is not identified as being potentially contaminated therefore an informative is considered sufficient to advise the applicant of potential contamination.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local built environment but would give rise to a degree of overshadowing, loss of outlook and an increased sense of enclosure for the occupiers of the neighbouring property, 25 Juniper Walk. However, having regard to the ‘fallback’ position of ‘permitted development’ entitlements, it is considered that, on balance, refusal could not be substantiated on grounds of unacceptable detriment to the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupier. Consequently the proposed development not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District

Local Plan (AG1, AH7) or the policies of the South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1)

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Brickwork to match existing dwelling
3. Notwithstanding the materials detailed on the plans, the roof shall be finished in fibre glass simulated lead in accordance with the emails of clarification and roof plan and dated 22 March 2012 and 4 April 2012.
4. No windows or other openings in north east side wall of the extension
5. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Drawing No:12/09 Date Received: 4 April 2012
   Drawing No:12/09/1 Date Received: 4 April 2012
   Drawing No:12/09/2 Date Received: 4 April 2012
   Unnumbered site plan received 4 April 2012
   Email of clarification and brochure extract received 22 March 2012

Informative:- Precautionary contamination

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

Case Officer: Rebekah Smith Date: 14 May 2012

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 15 May 2012