Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0850/16 Recommendation – Approve

Site: 37 Gordon Road, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Part retrospective application for removal of toilet and store to rear and construction of single storey rear extension (amendment to AWDM/1435/15)

Date of site visit: 23 June 2016

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a mid-terrace house on the north side of Gordon Road. Permission was granted in 2015 for a single storey rear extension which measures 3.6m deep, 3.4m wide and 3.4m high at its highest point. It has a monopitched roof with the lowest point 2.7m high abutting the house, sloping up to the highest point furthest from the house. It is to be finished in non-matching materials; namely, clad in timber boarding with a fibreglass (GRP) roof.

This application seeks permission for a revision to the design with the height of the roof closest to the house increased to 3.1m and a large window in the side which was required to be obscure glazed under the previous permission, altered to a high level window, to be clear glazed. The bottom of the frame will be 1.75m from the floor level.

Relevant site history

None

Consultations

None

Representations

None received

Relevant Planning Policies

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 (March 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading of the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. 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 amenity

The design of the extension is unusual in that the roof slopes up from the rear wall of the house so the highest point is furthest from the house. This results in a taller vertical wall than would be the case if it had a traditionally designed sloping roof, which is more common in the vicinity of the site.

The use of timber boarding as an external finish for the walls does not match the materials used in the original house and would also be out of keeping with the more traditional use of brick found elsewhere in the street.

Nevertheless, the extension is at the rear of the dwelling and is not visible from the street. It is a relatively modest addition which is only marginally deeper in projection that the neighbouring extensions to the east and west. In terms of scale, it is considered to be appropriate.

While the design and use of materials is not in keeping with other lean-to extensions at the rear of these dwellings, it is not considered that sufficient visual harm will arise in the wider area to warrant a refusal of the application. On balance, it is considered to be acceptable.

Residential amenity

The extension projects beyond the rear wall of the extension on the attached house to the west by approximately 0.6m. The boundary is formed by a closeboard fence with an ivy covered structure above which provides a partial screen to the neighbour. It is not considered that the extension will cause a significant loss of light or outlook for the neighbour to the west.

To the east, the neighbouring dwelling has a rear single storey extension with a blank side wall. A high level window is proposed in the side of the extension which would have clear views across the low boundary wall towards the neighbouring house. It is smaller than the window originally proposed and is not considered to be as intrusive. While views towards the neighbour will be possible, mutual overlooking already occurs from existing windows and it is possible to gain clear views into the neigbouring garden from the applicant's garden. It is considered that, on balance, a condition to require the window to be obscure glazed is not reasonable or necessary as no serious loss of amenity will arise from this proposal.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Permission relates to approved plans
2. Materials as specified

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

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 18 July 2016

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 18 July 2016