Expiry Date - 21/07/2010

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0182/10 **Recommendation – Permit Application**

Site: **24 Cheal Close Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5RQ**

Proposal: **Enlarged replacement single-storey rear extension**

The Application

The application property is a semi detached bungalow with a flat roofed rear extension. It is proposed to increase the size of the extension to create a larger lounge, kitchen and dining area. The extension will be 4m deeper at 11.3m long and 0.7m wider at 4.5m, with a rendered finish to the walls. The extension is on the eastern side of the property.

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

None

Third Parties

1 letter received from the occupier of 60 Riverside Road at the rear of the site stating that they have no objection to the proposed extension but do object to the proposed 2m high fence on the boundary. They claim that the garden at 24 Cheal Close is at a higher level and the fence will cause their garden to be in shade.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993 – 2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies

Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general. The proportion of the garden area taken up by a proposal should not be excessive.

Government policy is set out in Planning Policy Statement PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development'. Relevant paragraphs are 17, which refers to the commitment to protecting and improving the environment; 18 which states that planning should seek to maintain and improve the local environment and help to mitigate the effects of declining environmental quality through positive policies on issues such as design; and 34 which states that good design is indivisible from good planning and that design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area, should not be accepted.

Visual amenity and character

The proposed extension will project significantly into the rear garden along the eastern boundary of the property. It will be flat roofed and will come to within 7.5m of the rear boundary. While an extension of this depth would not normally be considered acceptable, it is quite a narrow extension and will not take up a substantial proportion of the garden area. The intention is to provide an open plan kitchen and living area with views into the garden to the west of the extension in order to provide a secure and supervised area for the applicants' autistic son. The garden area remaining after the extension is built will still be in excess of the Council's Standard. It is not considered therefore that the proposal will have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the property.

Residential amenity

The extension is flat-roofed and will be largely screened from view from the neighbour to the east, No.22, by a line of conifer trees within No.22's garden. The garden of No.24 steps up at the rear and the extension will be sited on lower ground thereby reducing its impact from views to the north. The adjoining dwelling to the north, 60 Riverside Road, currently has an open boundary with the site, consisting of a wire mesh fence and planted shrubs. Part of the application proposal originally was to erect a 2m high fence along the boundary which led to the occupier of No.60 Riverside Road objecting to the possible loss of light to their garden.

The garden of No.24 is slightly raised above that of their neighbour, following some earth moving works carried out in recent years. While a 2m high fence does not normally require planning permission, the height of the fence above natural ground level (which is lower on the neighbour's side) has led to the

neighbour's concerns being acknowledged by the applicant and the fence has now been removed from the application.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that:-

1PPi

Subject to:

1. C1Ci
2. This permission relates to the following approved plans date stamped received 26 May 2010:
   - Site Location Plan (drg no 10.1552.01)
   - Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations (drg no 10.1548.11) but not including the erection of a 2m high close boarded fence on the rear boundary

   Reason– For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning and amenity having regard to Policy AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan

Case Officer Peter Barnett Date 1 July 2010