Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0233/10 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 59 The Drive, Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 5GD

Proposal: Replace existing garage with single-storey side extension to create utility room/garden room. Canopy over existing front door on north side

The Application

The property is a semi-detached house with a two-storey rear extension that wraps along the side of the formerly sloping ('catslide') side roof.

The existing detached garage, measuring 5.9m long by 2.5m wide, is situated 3.6m to the rear of the house (projecting 9.4m overall), adjacent to the north side boundary.

It would be demolished and replaced by a single-storey extension, 3.1m wide and 9.6m long, situated partly at the side of the existing house (on part of the existing driveway) and projecting 7m from the rear corner of the house. It would have large glazed patio doors in the south side, a rear window and front door. It would have a tiled shallow hipped roof on the front portion (maximum height 2.6m) and a tiled mono-pitch (max height 3m and sloping down to the south) on the rear portion, where it is adjacent to the neighbour's garage (No.61). The latter is on ground about 0.6m higher.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: No comments received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

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.'
PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

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, 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 and should comply with the Council's DC standards.

The Council's DC Standard No.3 states that side extensions should be designed to match the existing dwelling if they are clearly visible from the

road. It also states they should be 1m from the side boundary, especially two-storey extensions, to avoid creating a terracing or cramped effect.

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

In this particular case, although abutting the side boundary, the proposed extension would not appear cramped, particularly because of its lower ground level than the neighbouring property to the north. It is set well back from the front of the house and would not affect the streetscene. Its roof design is acceptable.

Residential amenity

The house to the north No.61 would not be affected to any significant degree owing to the difference in ground levels. Most of the extension is alongside its garage and no greater in overall height even on the taller mono-pitched portion. The front portion is sufficiently low as not to be overbearing.

The attached house to the south No.57 is on the same level as the applicant's house but its garden is lower. The only potential effect of the proposal would be from the large south-facing glazed doors in the proposed garden room. These doors would be 5.8m from the common side boundary on which there is a close-boarded fence with trellis above, giving an overall height of approximately 2.2m. Although the internal floor level would be higher than the existing ground level, at the distance from the boundary, it is considered that the angle of view over the solid part of the fence would be such that the degree of overlooking would not warrant refusal. There is, in any case, already overlooking of the neighbour's rear garden from the applicant's existing rear patio doors which are directly adjacent to the fence/trellis.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that:-

1PPi The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7).

Subject to:-

1. C1Ci
2. C12Ei
3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:-
   Drawing No's 163.10.01 (Survey Floor Plans & Cross Section); 163.10.02 (Survey Elevations, Block Plan & Location Plan); 163.10.03 (Proposed Floor Plans & Block Plan); and 163.10.04 (Proposed Elevations & Block Plan) all date stamped received 2 July 2010.
   R. In the interests of proper planning and for the avoidance of doubt.

Case Officer: Keith Morgan Date: 17 August 2010