Expiry Date -

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/1224/13**

Recommendation – REFUSE

Site: **20 The Driveway, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5GG**

Proposal: **Extension to form garage and extended entrance hall**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a single storey front extension to measure (at max) 3.5 metres in height, 5 metres in length, and 5.8 metres in width.

The application property is one of a pair of interwar two-storey properties with front bays. There is an existing single storey extension off its eastern flank.

The submitted plans show a proposed new vehicular access. This piece of development can be undertaken without the prior consent of the local planning authority.

Relevant Planning History

None

Consultations

None

Representations

Objection received from occupier of St Giles House, 15 The Drive, summarised below:
Intention is to remove front wall to allow vehicular access. This access would be next to a six-foot fence to our back garden that would restrict visibility and hence endanger pedestrians and other road users. No planning application appears to have made in respect of this and in fact the application submitted clearly shows in Section 5 Pedestrian and Vehicle Access, Roads and Rights of Way that there are no proposed alterations. The application is therefore technically inaccurate and requires clarification. Design and Appearance – Properties in the area of similar age and appearance on similar plot sizes all have garages set behind the main part of the house. They do not protrude in front of the main part of the house and at worst in the immediate vicinity sit flush with the front of the house excluding the depth of protruding porches and bay

windows. In all cases there is a hard standing of sufficient depth for a car to sit on while waiting to enter or leave the garage. However in this case over one third of the proposed garage will be in front of the main part of the house and will leave less than three metres from the front of the garage to the boundary. Therefore granting planning permission would set a dangerous precedent that others may follow. There had previously been a garage on the site but this was knocked down to build a recent extension. In reality the plot was extended to its maximum potential at this point. This is clear in the fact that the only way to now squeeze a garage in is to breach several planning guidelines and as such constitutes overdevelopment of the site. Further to previous comments I have read the Council's Development Control Standard No.3. I believe that the proposed development breaches Section 1.11 part a) which states that the proposals would not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, loss of natural light or overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. The development would result in both a loss of natural light and would also have an overbearing effect on our property. Under Section 2.2 The Effect on Neighbouring Properties, both points ii) Daylight, and point iii) Outlook, would be breached by the proposed development. Finally, Garage Section 3.19 states that there should be a hardstanding of 6 m in length in front of a garage so that cars waiting to enter will be obstruct the highway. From the plans it would appear that the proposed garage will only be around 3 metres from the boundary. I also note that from the application there is no intention to move the vehicle access. I would question the physical possibility of actually getting a car into this garage under the current proposals. The plan also differs from the application. The plan shows the removal of the front wall to allow access however the application for planning permission says there will no changes. If the front wall is removed then a new vehicle crossover will be required but again not included within the application. The proposed development is shown to abut our boundary fence and because of its height will take light from our kitchen window. Previous development of the site has already significantly reduced the light we receive. I also believe the development breeches the 45 degree rule in respect of our right to light and would be grateful for the Council's opinion on this matter before granting planning permission.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

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'
Assessment of Saved Policies (ADC 2013)
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading of the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

The Driveway is a street with a pleasant suburban character. Properties along it are predominately typical suburban semis of the late inter-war period. Most of these retain their original low boundary brick walls, and the street is tree lined with grass verges.

Both sides of the immediate stretch of street have a well-defined building line, which positively contributes toward defining the street's local distinctiveness. Past extensions to the properties along this street have respected this building line, so ensuring the main dwellinghouse remains the most prominent building element in the street.

This proposed development would protrude prominently forward of the front face of the building by more than 2 metres, whilst straddling the entirety of 'gap' between the east site boundary and the existing dwelling. Due to these awkward proportions and its forward siting, the proposal would sit uncomfortably against the dwellinghouse and appear poorly integrated with its form and shape, whilst also being visually obtrusive, disrupting the building line and visual hierarchy of the street to the detriment of its character and appearance.

This harm would be exacerbated by the unsympathetic shallow roof of the proposed extension compared to the deeper proportions of the dwellinghouse roof, the oddity of having the front entrance door to the dwelling visually severed from the main house by being located in the extension, and the loss of the front boundary wall which will expose the proposed extension further still.

Parking

The plans show no reduction in on-site parking provision to cater for the demand generated by the household so no exacerbation of on-street parking would occur.

Highway Safety

The highway is a quiet residential street with little traffic and reasonable visibility along it. Once built there would be reduced space on the site for vehicles to maneuver, so any car would have exit/enter in reverse.

Since the prior consent of Adur District Council is not required for the vehicular access, it is for the highway authority when granting the licence under the Highway Act to consider the issue of highway safety.

Residential amenity – effect on existing dwellings

It is the immediate neighbour to the east who is principally impacted upon by this development (it is physically removed from the remainder).

This neighbouring property is built at an angle to the application site, and it has been extended by way of a flat roof single storey extension. A kitchen window is on the building's existing flank, which looks out onto the shared boundary fence.

This fence already blocks most light and outlook to this kitchen window. However the proposal being built hard up against the shared boundary with this neighbour would deprive this window from almost all light and outlook, to the detriment of the residential amenities of that neighbour.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the reasons:

1. The proposal, by reason of its awkward proportions and protrusion forward of the existing dwellinghouse, would sit uncomfortably against the dwellinghouse appearing poorly integrated with its form and shape whilst also being visually obtrusive, disrupting the building line and visual hierarchy of the street to the detriment of its character and appearance. As such the proposal conflicts with Saved Adur District Local Plan policy AH7 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposal, by reason of its position immediately adjacent to the shared boundary with the neighbouring building to the east, would result in unacceptable loss of light and outlook to that property's kitchen to the detriment of the living conditions of the occupants in conflict with Saved Adur District Local Plan policy AH7 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to resolve those matters within the timescale allocated for the determination of this planning application. However, the Local Planning Authority has clearly set out, within its report, the steps necessary to remedy the harm identified within the reasons for refusal - which may lead to the submission of a more acceptable proposal in the future. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 21-11-2013

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 21 November 2013