Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0344/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 42 Adur Drive, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex BN43 6PL

Proposal: Proposed side and rear single storey extensions

Date of site visit: 14.04.2016

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a two storey, end of a terrace of 8 no. residential properties. The terrace is set forward of the adjoining terraced row to the south by some 5m. The property has a pebble dash finish and a high brick plinth. The terraced properties to the south are brick faced.

The property has a low brick walled front garden area and many within this terrace have turned the front amenity area over to hard standing for car parking.

The property has undertaken a single storey mono pitch side extension. The attached property to the north, No. 44, has a small rear conservatory, and a wide rear dormer. No. 48 and 50 have undertaken a single storey rear extension approx. 3m deep, and No. 54 has a rear extension approx. 5m deep.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single-storey rear extension extending across the full width of the house to within 150mm of the north side boundary with No. 44. It will measure 7.1m wide x 3.8m deep with a set of bi-fold doors to the rear elevation. It will have a false pitch roof with 3no. roof lights within it. There will be a flat central area containing a roof lantern.

The side extension will be single storey and join to the existing side extension, and will adjoin the proposed rear extension. It will have an overall length of 11.5m and a width of approx. 1.5m with a lean-to pitch roof containing a total of 2no. rooflights. There will be 2no. small windows in the side elevation and a window will also be provided within the front elevation.

Consultations: None undertaken.

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7

Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extension which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The proposed side extension has been designed to complement the proportions and appearance of the existing single-storey side element and would be carried out in matching materials. The marginal set-back of 300mm from the front elevation will maintain a subordinate visual relationship to the host dwelling. A gap of at least 1m will be retained on the boundary with No.40 which is set back further in its plot to the east.

The proposed rear extension would not be readily viewed outside of the site, although it would be seen by the neighbouring residential properties.

Residential Amenity

The proposed rear extension will not impinge on the visual amenities of no. 40, given that they are set back from the application site, and the extension would be in a similar line to the rear of that property. The side extension would be in view from no. 40 but only obliquely as they have built up to the boundary with a single storey, mono pitch extension, which contributes to generally closing the views to the extension. No. 40 do have a first floor window which can view the extension, but that window is in the original dwelling and appears to be a landing window.

The neighbouring property to the north, no. 44, will be able to view the rear extension, which at a depth of 3.8m is 300mm deeper than the Council’s standard of 3.5m for single-storey rear extensions to terraced and semi-detached houses set out in the SPG Development Control Standard No. 3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’. However, the roof of the extension has been designed with a false-pitched ‘skirt’ sloping away from the common boundary with No.44 and with an eaves height of 2.5m. On balance, it is considered it would be difficult to justify refusal on grounds of demonstrable harm to the amenities of No.44 in terms of overbearing effect or unacceptable loss of light notwithstanding the orientation of the extension to the south of No.44. In arriving at this decision consideration has been given to the absence of any objection from the neighbour to the proposals.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Materials to match existing

4. No windows to be formed in the side (north) facing no. 44 of the extension
5. The 2 no. westernmost windows in south side to be obscured

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 letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 28.04.2016

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 28.04.2016