Expiry: 28/8

Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0853/24 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 4 Stoney Lane, Shoreham

Proposal: Single storey rear extension next to existing rear outrigger with roof to match existing.

Date of site visit: 14/8

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a semi detached bungalow on the west side of Stoney Lane just south of the Holmbush roundabout and opposite the fire station. The property has a south side driveway.

As built these bungalows have deeper rear additions on their outside walls. Permission is sought to square off the rear elevation up to the shared boundary.

The extension measures 3.5 metres in depth. The new roof will line through with the existing roof which has an eaves height greater than the original bungalow. It will have a maximum height of 3.5 metres when measured from natural ground level including 2 steps down to the patio. A roof lantern is also proposed It is 2.8 metres wide.

Relevant Planning History

None.

Consultations

None.

Representations

None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023)

Expiry: 28/8

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal involves upgrading 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.

Residential amenity

No. 2, to the north has not extended to the rear. The extension will be on the boundary to a depth of 3.5 metres.

It abuts the patio doors of No. 4 and there is a 1.9 high metre fence on the common boundary.

Adopted Policy 15: Quality of the Built Environment requires that development *'does not have an unacceptable impact on adjacent properties, particularly residential dwellings, including unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, outlook or open amenity space;'*

It goes on to say:

'When considering applications for extensions or alterations to dwellings, proposals will be expected to comply with the criteria contained in the Council's adopted Development Management Standard No.2 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" (as amended or superseded by other Council guidance in force at the time an application is considered) or any other appropriate national standard.'

In para 3.3 of DM2:

'Where dwellings have been built with projecting sections it would not usually be acceptable to build an extension infilling the space between the projection and the boundary with an attached dwelling, unless both property owners co-operate to build a combined extension. This is because the property which was not extended would be left with rooms in a deep recess which would have a poor outlook and insufficient light.'

The extension is proposed up to the boundary with a roof height greater than the original eaves. The applicant was invited to consider a reduced extension, in height and/or depth or a more lightweight construction. Due to the family's needs this was not possible.

It is not considered that the extension as submitted is acceptable. It will leave No. 2's living room in a deep recess and being due south of it will have an unacceptable impact on their light as well as an oppressive enclosing impact.

Expiry: 28/8

Visual amenity

The extension is to the rear. It will not be harmful to general visual amenity.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the following reason:

The siting, height and depth of the extension proposed would have a 'tunnelling effect' on No. 2 and would lead to a loss of light and outlook and result in an overbearing impact. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, adopted Development Management Standard No. 2 and the relevant paragraphs of the national Planning Policy Framework.

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:	MOK	Date: 10/9/24
Authorised by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 10 September 2024