Expiry Date – 6/7 – ppa to 30/7

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0724/16 Recommendation – Approve

Site: 62 Hammy Lane, Shoreham

Proposal: First floor rear extension and new pitched roof to existing ground floor extension. (Revised Proposal).

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 24.6.16

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to an end of terrace 1950's house on the east side of Hammy Lane. The property has been extended at ground floor rear with a 5.7 metre flat roofed extension half the width of the rear elevation and closest to the southern boundary. Nos. 62 and 60, the terrace to the south, are separated by side passages with a combined width of 2 metres. No. 64, to the north is unextended.

The property is not in a conservation area, is not listed and there are no protected trees on the site.

Proposal

The application has been revised since first submitted. Originally submitted to the full depth of the existing ground floor addition the first floor has been cut back and is now proposed to extend 3.5 metres from the back wall. The remaining flat roof at ground floor is proposed with a shallow pitched roof.

The applicant has raised the following in support of the application;

Our neighbours extension on the boundary to the north at number 68 built in 1987 is at least 3.5m in length. The 2.9m extension was a later addition in 2006.
We cannot go into the loft due to its height and if we reduce the extension further we will not be able to create the internal space we need.

Relevant Planning History

SU/214/83/TP/FP – single storey rear extension. Granted 3.1.84

Consultations

None undertaken

Representations

1 objection from No. 64 received to the revised proposal summarized as follows:

1. Too big and will block light to rear of house at 64.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012
Saved Adur Local Plan policy AG1, AH7
Emerging Adur Local Plan policy 15
Development Control Standard No 3 - Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development can be supported as it upgrades a dwelling within the built up area boundary by providing additional living accommodation on the upper floor.

The main issues for consideration are the impact of the development on neighbours and on the appearance of the area and precedent /fallback..

Neighbour impact

Saved Adur Local Plan policy AH7 states:

> Extensions and alterations to existing houses and bungalows will be expected to be designed so that:-
> (a) proposals would not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, loss of natural light or overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings;
> (b) design and materials are sympathetic to both the original dwelling and the area in general;
> (c) the proportion of the garden area taken by the proposal would not be excessive having regard to the character of the area;
> (d) access and car parking provision is acceptable under Policy AT12, and
> (e) proposals accord with the standards adopted by the District Planning Authority

The revised proposal has been materially reduced in size to address concerns raised by officers and the neighbour over light and outlook.

The extension accordingly avoids breaking a 45 degree angle to the living room and bedroom windows in No. 64, to the north. As a consequence light to habitable rooms in 64 will not be significantly affected.

The impact on No 64's garden has been reduced but remains the most significant potential impact. The garden lies due south of No. 64 and No.66 has a conservatory extension on the boundary with No. 64.

However, given the separation gap of just less than 4 ms; hipped roof form; and the existence of the deep current single storey addition at No 62 and current common boundary fence , the impact on overshadowing is unlikely to be so significant that refusal could be sustained.

Allied to the issue of loss of sunlight is outlook. Again some loss would occur but given that no 64's principal outlook is due east and only oblique views from the rear windows would be affected, the impact on the living accommodation would be modest. Some loss of outlook from the garden would occur, principally from the area immediately adjacent to the back elevation of the house. However, the impact is unlikely to be so significant that refusal could be sustained even in combination with the overshadowing given the factors listed previously.

The facing flank of the extension is blank so no overlooking would result.

Turning to No 60, this is separated from the site by the width of two side passages and lies to the south. The downsizing also reduces the impact on this neighbour materially. The existing extension already satisfies the 45 degree rule of thumb natural light and outlook tests measured against the rear kitchen window at No. 60. The additional storey likewise meets this as it is materially shorter, regardless of the increased height.

There are two rooflights that face the garden of No 60 but these are secondary windows and high level and avoid overlooking. The new flank window in the main house is shown and obscure glazed and may be conditioned as such.

Design

The design of the extensions is acceptable on this rear elevation.

Precedent and fallback

Also relevant to the consideration is that of precedent and fall back under the GPDO and which weigh in favour of the proposal.

Other 2 storey rear extensions exist at close by at 68 and 54 Hammy Lane. No. 54 is the more comparable in its relationship to neighbours and is thought to be 3 metres in depth. No. 68's is in part deeper but is due north of the adjoining terraced house. This suggests end of terrace two storey extensions are an established feature of the area.

The fallback under the GPDO gives an idea of what the applicant may decide to build should permission not be granted. It is apparent that a substantial single storey extension of up to 3.ms tall to the eaves and 3 metres deep could be built right up to the boundary which would be arguably much more invasive. In this light removal of PD rights to build such is justified.

Conclusion

On balance the proposal is supportable.

Recommendation Approve.

1. Build in 3 years
2. Build in accordance with approved drawings
3. No new windows in upper flor of flank of extension.
4. Obscure glaze flank window in upper floor of south elevation
5. Matching materials
6. Remove PD rights to build single storey rear extension .

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: MOK Date: 22.7.16

Authorised and signed by: PD Date: 25.7.16