Expiry Date – 31.5.16

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0509/16 Recommendation – Grant

Site: 2B East Meadway, Shoreham

Proposal: **Single storey rear extension**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 5.5.16

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a two storey semi detached house on the north side of East Meadway close to the junction with Shingle Road. These houses were built in 2005 and a restrictive condition attached to the original permission removes the right to extend under permitted development.

Proposal

A single storey extension is sought measuring 3 metres in depth and across the back of the property. It is proposed with a mono pitched roof with an eaves height of 2.3 metres and a ridge height of 3.5 metres.

Relevant Planning History

SU/0167/03 - Demolition of Existing Bungalow & Erection of Pair of Three-Bedroom Semi-Detached Houses with Parking Space at Front. Granted 20.10.03.

Consultations

None undertaken.

Representations

None received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012
Saved policies AG1 and AH7 of the Adur Local Plan.
Development Control Standard No. 2 – 'Space around new dwellings and flats'.
Development Control Standard No. 3 – 'Extension and Alterations to Dwellings
Draft Adur Local Plan

Planning Assessment

The principle of development can be supported as it upgrades an existing dwelling in an established residential area. The impact on neighbours is the main issue for consideration together with the loss of garden space.

The adjoining semi, 2a, has not been extended at the rear. The garden is divided by a typical 1.8 metre high panel fence. It is not considered that the scale of the extension proposed will be harmful to 2A.

No. 4, to the east, is a different style of house and sits 4 metres deeper into the rear garden. It has a side door and window but these are mid-way along the length of the flank. The extension will not be harmful to their amenity. The east facing side window proposed is 1 metre off the boundary and this boundary is defined by a 1 .8 metre high fence. Again, no significant harm by way of overlooking is anticipated.

The proposed extension removes valuable useable garden space. The house as built has a rear garden of less than 85 square metres, the standard identified for new 3 bed semi detached houses in the adopted Development Control Standard 'Space around new dwellings and flats'. This extension would reduce the garden to approximately 50 sq metres in area with an average length of 8.5 metres. This is inconsistent with the advice on garden sizes set out in Development Control Standard No. 3 – 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings', which again looks for a garden size of 85 sqm for a small 3 bed semi such as this with an average length of 11 metres.

Notwithstanding Standards 2 and 3 and however regrettable, it is not considered that the extension represents a serious overdevelopment of the plot or would leave the house with an inadequate private rear garden for this family home such that refusal could be justified . The beach is within walking distance too and clearly the current occupier has made their own trade off between external and internal space needs .

Recommendation APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved Plans
2. 3 years
3. Materials to Match

Informative

1. 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:	MOK	Date: 11.5.16
Authorised and signed by:	PD	Date: 11.5.16