Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0192/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 19 Mill Lane Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5NA

Proposal: Single-storey rear extension to south-west elevation to replace existing conservatory and outbuilding

Date of site visit: 29.03.2016

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a semi-detached house dating from the 1930s located on the southwest side of Mill Lane. There is an attached garage to the northwest side and a detached outbuilding in the rear garden adjacent to the northwest site boundary.

The surrounding area is made up of a mix of dwelling styles and types. The attached house, No.17, has been enlarged by a single-storey rear extension, first-floor side extension and rooms in the roof with side gable and rear dormer. To the northwest, No.21, a mansard-style detached chalet house, has been enlarged by a single-storey flat-roofed rear extension.

Surrounding land slopes up to the north so that No.21 occupies higher ground.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single-storey rear extension extending across the full width of the house (7.8m wide and 6m deep). It would have a parapet flat roof having a maximum height of 3.6m. The outbuilding would be removed. [At the time of the officer site visit the conservatory had already been removed.]

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 extension would almost double the footprint of the existing dwelling and exceeds the 3.5m depth for single-storey rear extensions set out in the Council's SPG. However, the dwelling plots on this side of the road are relatively deep and it is considered a single-storey extension of this scale can be accommodated satisfactorily without resulting in an over-developed appearance. A condition can be imposed to ensure that the existing detached outbuilding is removed.

The extension is located wholly at the rear of the dwelling and would have no impact on the street-scene.

Residential Amenity

The only affected properties are No.17 to the south and No.21 to the north.

The proposed extension would extend some 3 metres beyond the rear of the attached neighbour's at No.17. The height of the extension is uncharacteristically tall owing to the parapet roof design and would have the potential to have an oppressive impact. However, it is set-in marginally from the common boundary and in view of its orientation to the northwest of No.17 together with its light-coloured rendered finish it is considered the effect on the outlook from and daylight to No.17 would not be unacceptable. There are no openings proposed in the southeast side of the extension.

The proposed extension would also extend beyond the rear of the neighbour's extension to the northwest at No.21. That latter occupies higher ground and the heads of 2 windows in the south flank wall are visible above the boundary wall/fence. The windows serve a dining room and planning records show it is also served by a larger window in the rear-facing elevation. A small window in the south side of the original part of No.21 serves a WC. [The approved extension at No.21 would have no openings in the south side – AWDM/0497/14 refers.] Owing to its height and depth the proposed extension would have some impact on receipt of light to these existing windows at No.21, but the effect on the room in question would not be so severe as to warrant refusal. Two floor-to-ceiling windows are proposed in the northwest flank wall of the extension but are shown to be obscure-glazed and in any event would largely face onto the boundary wall/fence. A new door and window in the north side of the existing part of the dwelling are also proposed to be obscure-glazed. Consequently it is considered there would be no adverse effect on the privacy of No.21.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans

3. Existing outbuilding removed prior to first occupation of the proposed extension
4. Matching materials
5. No additional side openings
6. Obscure-glaze windows in north side

Informative

1. Pro-Active – No Amendment
2. Southern water

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 31.03.2016

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 4 April 2016