Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – Approve**
AWDM/0473/17

Site: **71 Buckingham Road**

Proposal: **Part first-floor and part two-storey side extension to north elevation**

Date of site visit: 12-4-17
Neighbours checked: Y
Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a detached two-storey dwellinghouse in an inner neighbourhood of Shoreham.

The proposal is for a first floor/two-storey extension to measure 6.1 metres in height, 6.7 metres in width, and 10.3 metres in length.

Relevant site history
None

Consultations
None

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies
National Planning Policy Framework
Saved Local Plan policies: AH7, AG1

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Visual amenity

Despite the varying building styles and design along Buckingham Road there is general consistency in the scale of buildings in the street. As amended, the extension would still be bulky and would result in a large expanse of vertical wall along the entire length of the north side of the dwelling, where there is currently a hipped roof. However, on balance, the scale and proportion, and form and shape of the extension would not cause serious visual harm to the architectural integrity of the host dwelling. It would confirm the principles of subservience and the resultant building would not appear cramped. Its roof pitches, exterior materials/finishes and fenestration would all match the host.

Residential amenity

The neighbours principally impacted upon are those to the north and rear (it is physically removed from the remainder to avoid harm to living conditions – including by way of overlooking across the already public street).

Neighbour to north

The proposed extension would bring built form closer to the shared boundary with this neighbouring building.

However the extension would not protrude beyond the existing rear wall of the host building. The neighbouring building has no first floor habitable room windows in its south elevation. Outlook and light received by the sole ground floor habitable room window is already curtailed as the window faces the boundary fence and silhouette of the existing host building. Therefore any resultant overbearing and/or overshadowing arising from the extension would not be adverse.

In terms of overlooking, first floor openings in the north elevation of the extension would be limited to a top hung window that could be obscure glazed. Overlooking from the rear window would be oblique onto this neighbour rather than direct.

Neighbours to rear

The development would be sufficiently distant from the neighbouring buildings in this direction as to avoid adverse overbearing/overshadowing.

The rear first floor window can be obscured and would result in no greater propensity for overlooking (esp. given the current views afforded by existing rear facing windows).

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans

2. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

3. Materials and finishes to match
4. The first floor en-suite window in the west (rear) and first floor bathroom window in the north (side) elevations shall be obscure glazed and top hung
5. Notwithstanding “pd” no further windows/openings in either side and/or rear elevation at first floor without prior permission

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, 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: Matthew Porter Date: 2-6-17

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 5 June 2017