Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number:
AWDM/0983/13

Recommendation – GRANT PRIOR APPROVAL

Site: **13 Rosslyn Road**

Proposal: **Householder application for permitted development for prior approval for single storey extension to rear of property measuring 3.5 m from rear wall of the original house, maximum height 2.5 m and height of eaves of the extension 2.5 m**

Neighbours checked: Y
Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a rear extension to measure 3.5 metres from the original rear wall, 2.5 metres in height with eaves height of 2.5 metres.

The application property is a semi-detached Victorian two-storey period building. It exhibits a section of horizontal timber cladding at the rear.

Brick walls define each of the side boundaries to neighbours.

Relevant Planning History
AWDM/0831/13
Householder application for permitted development for prior approval for single storey extension to rear of property measuring 5m from rear wall of the original house, maximum height 2.7m and height of eaves of the extension
Withdrawn 07.08.2013

Consultations
None

Representations
Objection received from occupiers of No. 15 Rosslyn Road, summarised below:-

- *Although I appreciate others haven't expressed concern over such extensions, I am still concerned by such a structure. The loss of light into our back room ,which has enjoyed the same light in excess of 25 years, with the original French door aperture*
- *The proximity to our original Victorian wall, which we're very keen for building work not to undermine the integrity of.*

- *The proximity and height of the extension to our boundary is overbearing; being semi-detached and having French doors so close to the boundary, means that the extension will reduce light levels and dominate our view.*
- *The loss of evening sun onto our patio area.*

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
Adur Local Plan: AG1, AH7
National Planning Policy Framework

Planning Assessment

Residential amenity – effect on existing dwellings

It is the neighbours either side of the application site who are principally impacted upon by this development (it is physically removed from the remainder).

Neighbour to west

The windows to this neighbouring building are positioned off from the shared boundary, and there would be a gap between the flank of the extension and this neighbouring building. This ensures no adverse overbearing and overshadowing effect would arise.

Current boundary treatment would screen the majority of views afforded by any window in the extension flank facing this neighbour, so ensuing intrusive direct overlooking onto the neighbour would not occur, and instead any loss of privacy would limited to being oblique in its nature.

Adjoining neighbour to east

This neighbouring building is physically adjoining. It has a pair of ground floor French doors facing out at the rear elevation. These serve the principal habitable living space of the property. If the proposal were built out this room and the patio immediately outside of it, would experience a certain loss of outlook and loss of daylight and sunlight.

However the test of the acceptability of this type of proposal is laid out in the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance. This sets out that a rear extension of 3.5 metres in length on a semi-detached property would not result in unacceptable overbearing and/or overshadowing – even extensions built up hard against a shared boundary. The reasoning is that the shadow cast by an extension of this length would not be of such severity in terms of its impacts as to warrant refusal. This proposed extension complies with this standard.

Current boundary treatment would screen the majority of views afforded by any window in the extension flank facing this neighbour, so ensuing intrusive direct overlooking onto the neighbour would not occur, and instead any loss of privacy would limited to being oblique in its nature.

Recommendation

GRANT PRIOR APPROVAL for the reason:-

The proposed development can take place without any detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and consequently does not conflict with saved Adur Local Plan policies AG1, AH7 and the planning policies set out in the National Planning Policy Framework

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? Y

Case Officer
Signed: Matthew Porter Date: 16 -9-2013

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 17 September 2013