expiry 14/1/08.

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0699/07 **Recommendation – Permit Application**

Site: **20 Mill Lane Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5AG**

Proposal: **Two-storey side extension and alterations**

The Application

The property consists of a large brick and rendered semi detached two storey house. The property is accessed from Mill Lane by a concrete driveway running along the eastern side of the site. A flat roof garage is located adjacent to the eastern boundary in line with the existing dwelling.

A previous application was submitted and refused in October 2006 under application reference ADC/0270/06 for a first floor extension, on the eastern side of the dwelling over an existing side extension and part of the garage. The first floor addition was to extend the first floor of the property by 2.5 metres to within 1.24 metres of the eastern boundary. The height above ground level to the eaves of the side extension was proposed at 5.3 metres, level with the existing eaves height of the first floor of the house and approximately 2.6 metres above the existing flat roof of the garage. A pitched roof was proposed to be located over the extended roof area and an additional pitched roof is to be located on that part of the garage not covered by the first floor extension. This proposal was to provide an additional fourth bedroom and bathroom area. The application was refused for the following reason: -

'The proposed side extension, by reason of its unsympathetic design, would be out of keeping in scale and appearance with the existing building and would be out of keeping in scale and appearance with the existing building and would detract to an unacceptable extent from the visual amenities of the locality and thereby conflict with the policies of the West Sussex Structure Plan (CH1, DEV1) and the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7)'

The current application seeks to address the previous reason for refusal. The proposed side extension is set back from the front of the dwelling by 5.1 metres as a continuation of the existing roof line, as opposed to the previous application which was further forward at 4.1 metres from the front of the building. The overall design of the extension has been changed to a more flat roof, simple design which respects the character of the existing building and is more in keeping than the previous proposal. The pitched roof addition to the garage has also been removed in the current application.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: - No third party representations have been received.

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 II '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.

Character, Visual Amenity and Street Scene

The main issue in this case is the impact of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the existing building and street scene. The design of the proposed extension as opposed to the previous scheme is consistent with the existing design and scale of the building. The side extension is set back by 5.1 metres from the front of the building as oppose to 4.1 metres in the previously refused scheme. The flat roof design reflects that of the existing flat roofed parapet wall feature. The extension is also set back to allow it to be subservient to the main building and to not detract from the design and scale of the main building.

Residential Amenity

The previous scheme was not considered to have any adverse impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent properties. The current scheme is a reduction in bulk and size and therefore there is considered to be no loss of light or over bearing impact on the occupiers of the adjacent property as a result of this proposal.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :- 1PPi

1. C1Ci
2. C12Eii

RB 10/1/08

Case Officer V Baker Date 9/1/08