Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0028/17 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 32 Adelaide Square, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Single storey side extension to east elevation.

Date of site visit: 7.02.17

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposals

The application relates to a semi-detached two storey dwelling within a square of similar dwellings. The site is a corner, triangular shaped plot which is uniquely large for this style and scale of dwelling. There is a large lawn and patio and abutting the site to the south is the blank elevation of a large industrial building Apex House. Attached to the west is no. 30 Adelaide Square and to the north east is no. 34 also properties of similar style.

Consent is sought for a single storey side extension. The extension is to be set back from the front of the dwelling and will extend beyond the rear elevation of the main building. It is shown as 7.6 metres deep, 3.9 metres wide with a maximum height of 3.2 metres. It will project beyond the rear elevation of the dwelling by 4.3 metres. The extension will provide a kitchen dining room with the existing kitchen to be reconfigured to be a utility and study. The extension is shown as a flat roof design with a parapet roof. Bifolding doors are proposed on the western side toward the boundary with no. 30.

Amended plans have been received correcting an error on the plans as the height of the rear windows was shown incorrectly.

Consultations: none

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
Adur Submission Local Plan Policy 15.
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extension which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The proposed extension is set back to the side of the property and is within a corner site. Although the extension will be visible when viewed from the street this will only be from certain vantage points and due to its scale, set back and position any impact will not be such to dominate or detract from the street scene. The extension is in scale with the existing building and plot. It does not overly dominate the dwelling or street scene. The plans show work to be completed in brick to match existing. The current building is brick with the main part of the building being pebble dash. It was considered appropriate to accept this proposed use of materials. Insisting that the extension was brick and pebble dash to match completely the host building could ultimately be detrimental with no exact match possible and the simple form of the extension would be complimented by the use of bricks only here. It should also be noted here that the front elevation of the extension is blank with no openings shown. Due again to the set back and nature of the plot this is considered acceptable. There would be no real outlook to the front and the blank elevation contributes further to the simplistic ‘box style’ design.

Residential Amenity

The main properties to be affected are those either side of the site nos. 30 and 34. No 30 is attached to the west. However the extension being attached to the other side of the building means that there is separation between the extension and the boundary with no. 30. The bi-folding doors and main outlook from the extension being toward the rear garden of no. 30. Yet this is at a distance of 7.5 metres it is also not looking toward or into any adjacent windows. The existing boundary hedge and fence are relatively low so there would be the option of increasing the height of this boundary treatment (close boarded fence up to 2 metres in height) without planning permission. Yet on balance the proposed layout and relationship with no. 30 would not give rise to any significant loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact.

No 34 is to the north east. There is a side ground floor window facing toward the site, it is not clear what room this window serves. However as existing this faces onto the side boundary of the application site. Due to the corner plot there is wide spacing between the dwellings. Also due to the set back and position of the proposed extension within the plot it is not considered that the extension would result in any significant loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact to warrant a refusal in this case. The front blank elevation would be nearest to the neighbouring dwelling which would have no adverse impact.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. time limit
2. approved plans

2. materials to match brick only
3. no windows on the front/north elevation

Informative
1. proactive no amendments

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 20.02.2017

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 21.02.2017