Expiry Date -

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/0064/14

Site: **32 Beach Green**

Proposal: **Replacement single-storey rear extension with raised terrace area and cycle storage below**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a single-storey rear extension with decked terrace, steps, and screen fencing 1.8 metres high, all to measure (at max) 4.1 metres in height, 3.65 metres in length, and 4.9 metres in width.

The application property is a terraced two-storey property elevated from ground level by stepped access. It exhibits rendered walls. The building has been extended by way of a modest glazed extension at the rear.

The site is situated in an outer residential suburb of Shoreham, abutting the south bank of the River Adur.

Relevant Planning History
None

Consultations
None

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adur Local Plan: AG1, AH7
National Planning Policy Framework

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle

Visual amenity

The extension is not conspicuously visible from public vantage point. Its scale is appropriate to the building and it would be built of matching exterior materials. It would be similar in design to the extension immediate next door.

No visual harm would arise from it.

Residential amenity

It is neighbours either side who would be principally impacted upon by this development (it is physically removed from the remainder).

Neighbour to the north

The neighbour to the north has extended off the rear and the proposal would come only marginally forward of this, so adverse overbearing and overshadowing onto this neighbour would be avoided.

Overlooking from the extension onto the habitable rooms of this neighbour would be oblique and the terrace would be screened by a new 1.8 metre high boundary fence, so negating invasive loss of privacy.

Neighbour to the south

This neighbouring building has a kitchen window positioned close to the shared wall. This room would lose outlook and light as a result of the extension being built.

However, because both properties are built at the same elevated level, this resultant impact would be comparable to an extension built at ground level whereby a homeowner can build a rear extension to a length of up to 3 metres without requiring the prior permission of the local planning authority (this is termed permitted development).

Therefore this “fallback” should be given some weight in judging the severity of impact arising from the proposal.

In the current situation, the solid form (the proposed extension wall and close boarded fence) would be less than 3 metres in length, so the impact would be less than the permitted development scenario. Accordingly the resultant overbearing and overshadowing effect onto this neighbour would not be adverse, although it would inevitably occur to some degree.

It is noted that no objection has been made by this neighbour to the proposal.

The absence of windows/openings in the extension flank wall facing this neighbour means overlooking and loss of privacy would not be unacceptable.

Flood Risk

The site falls within Flood Zone 3, the highest category of flood risk.

However Environment Agency standing advice in relation to domestic extensions has been complied with as the living space is elevated from ground level, so no human health would be put at greater risk.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development can take place without detriment to the local environment and would not detract from the character or appearance of the area. It would not result in any detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and consequently does not conflict with saved Adur Local Plan policies AG1, AH7

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Exterior materials to match

Informative

> *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.*

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 24-2-2014

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 24 February 2014