Application Number: ADC/0337/08 **Recommendation - APPROVE**

Site: **21 River Close, Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 5YF**

Proposal: **Single-storey extensions to side and rear**

The Application

The property comprises the eastern one of a pair of linked semi-detached three-storey houses, situated at the eastern end of a row of similar houses backing onto the river bank. The houses have white rendered walls, gabled roofs and are within a 1960s development of similar houses. At a right angle, to the east, is a terrace of similar houses (No's 28-36 Beach Green) positioned with their small rear gardens backing onto the side of the applicant's house.

The current application seeks permission for single-storey extensions to the rear and side. The side extension comprises of a flat-roofed double garage, 2.3 metres high, 4.9 metres wide and the same overall depth as the house (8.8 metres). The rear extension comprises of a breakfast room which will be the same width as the existing house (5.5 metres), 3 metres deep and 7.5 metres high.

In 2007 permission was sought for a two storey extension occupying the entire width of the side garden to the eastern boundary of the property (ADC/0491/07). The application was withdrawn following officer's advice that it was unacceptable.
A reduced scheme was then submitted (ADC/0638/07). This was for the conversion of the existing integral garage and entrance into additional living space. At ground-floor level the extension proposed was 5 metres wide, 8.8 metres deep, accommodating a double garage, with its side wall 1 metre-3 metres from the east side boundary wall (due to the angle of the boundary.) At first-floor level the extension was narrower at 3 metres width and also proposed was a 3 metre by 1.3 metre deep rear balcony. The extension had a gabled roof for the upper part (ridge height 7.8 metres), with a flat roof on the ground floor part projecting eastwards (front parapet height 2.5 metres).
This application was refused by Committee on 5 December 2007 on grounds of overbearing impact and loss of light to the houses to the east. An appeal against the decision was dismissed.

In 1989 an application (SU/295/88) for a two-storey side extension had also been refused. It was shown 3.7 metres wide and 6 metres deep, recessed back from the front building line with a gabled roof 7.5 metres high.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: - A letter of objection has been received from the neighbouring residents at No.28 Beach Green, to the east, on grounds that: -

- The extension is extremely large covering a greater floor area than the existing house.
- The side of the extension faces onto the rear of their house and would be visually intrusive.

- It amounts to overdevelopment of the site, reducing the separation between the buildings to less than Adur's Development Standard of a minimum 14 metres.
- Approval of this development would set a precedent for conflict with planning standards.

[NB. the resident of No.28 Beach Green requests to speal at the Committee meeting]

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005) (saved policies): LOC1, DEV1
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: - Development Control Standard No. 3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies

Structure Plan policies seek to protect, and where possible, enhance the character and distinctiveness of an area, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general.

Development Control Standard No. 3 states amongst other things that on a corner plot a distance of 14 metres should be retained between principal windows at the rear of one property and the windows on the side of the other dwelling.

Visual Amenity – Character and Appearance

The appearance of the houses adjacent to the site remains relatively consistent, with minimal change to the front elevations. A small number of single-storey extensions/conservatories have been erected to the rear, including the attached house to the west.

The flat-roofed design and width of the proposed side extension is considered to be acceptable in terms of its appearance in this position. The angle of the existing dwelling and its location at the end of the cul-de-sac means that there will not be a significant impact on the streetscene. The flat roofed design and reduction in height and bulk compared to the previous application is considered to address the previous reason for refusal and basis for the Inspector's appeal decision.

The proposed rear extension will be in line with the existing extension to the attached house, No.20 River Close. It will be visible when viewed from the river bank public path to the rear of the site. However, it is modest in scale and matches the adjacent extension.

The extension will allow the application property to retain sufficient rear amenity space in excess of that required in the Council's Development Control Standard No. 3.

Residential Amenity – Daylighting

The neighbouring terraced house to the east is at a minimum distance of 9 metres from the side of the proposed garage extension. The Council's Development Control Standard No.3 states that where the rear of one house faces the side of another, a separation distance of 14 metres should be maintained (although DC Standard No.2 states this can be relaxed to 11m where one building is single storey)

Despite this separation distance being less than the standard, on balance, it is considered that the impact on the neighbouring properties would be acceptable. The extension now proposed is low in profile with a flat roof. It was loss of outlook and sense of enclosure, not loss of light, that were the reasons for the previous Inspector's decision in dismissing the previous taller proposal. He stated "The proposal as a whole would unacceptably harm the outlook from the gardens of those properties giving an undue feeling of enclosure." The current proposal is considered to overcome this issue of loss of outlook. Although the garage extension will be visible when viewed from first-floor windows and rear gardens of these houses, the height of the extension is not considered likely to impact to a significant degree.

The proposed rear extension will not have any adverse impact on No.20 River Close as there is an existing extension at this property and the proposal will be in line with it.

Residential Amenity – Privacy

No windows are proposed on the side elevations of either of the extensions. The garage has no windows, only a door to the front, and the breakfast room extension has a window facing north, towards the river. Therefore no issue of overlooking or loss of privacy arises in this case.

Access and Parking

The proposed double garage will provide sufficient parking for this dwelling.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) and the West Sussex Structure Plan (DEV1).

Subject to:-

1. C1Ci (Standard time limit)
2. C12Ei (External materials to match existing)
3. C18Eii (No windows to be formed in east side wall without permission)
4. C8B (Garage to be retained for parking at least one car and provision for access in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority)
5. C18F .....