Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/1668/14

Site: **67 Old Shoreham Road, Southwick**

Proposal: **Single-storey rear extension with link to garden basement. Rooms in roof with side gable, rear dormer and rooflights to front elevation**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for:-

- a single-storey rear extension to measure (at max) 2.7 metres in height, 6.8 metres in length, and 7.6 metres in width.
- a hip to gable roof extension with flat roof rear dormer to measure (at max) 3.6 metres in height, 8.5 metres in length, and 6 metres in width
- Garden basement to measure (at max) 3 metres in height, 13.6 metres in length, and 6.7 metres in width

The application property is an end of terrace two-storey detached dwellinghouse, of inter-war period.

The site is on a busy A-road, residential in its character.

Relevant Planning History
None

Consultations
None

Representations

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adur Local Plan (saved policies): AG1, AH7
National Planning Policy Framework

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle

Visual amenity

The hip-to-gable roof extension would not appear overtly out of character as there are some other examples of this in the street. The domestic scale of the host building would be retained. Those exterior materials and finishes of the extension would match the host. The same applies for the rear dormer, although this is large.

These elements of the proposal, and the impact resultant from them, could occur without the prior permission of the Council (they are shown for clarity only, as the work is “permitted development”).

The exterior flue is positioned close to the rear wall of the original house, to the same height as the existing chimney its same height.

The rear extension is of a domestic scale. Although it would be of render finish, this makes it distinct from the host building. Its front fenestration and door would match that on the host dwelling.

Insufficient visual harm would arise from it.

Residential amenity

The neighbours principally impacted upon by this development are those to either side (it is physically removed from the remainder).

Neighbour to west

The presence of the alleyway means the proposal is physically removed from this neighbouring building - so would not adversely overbear and overshadow (despite the 6.8 metres length of extension on this side).

Views from the rear fenestration would be oblique onto this neighbour, so intrusive overlooking and unacceptable loss of privacy would be avoided (the windows in the new roof gable will be obscured and serve landings).

Adjoining neighbour to east

This neighbouring building has living room fenestration close to the shared boundary. Outlook and light received would be reduced to a certain extent by the development.

However the extension is single storey and flat roofed, and boundary fencing already curtails light and outlook. Additionally, the extension at the point closest to the shared boundary has been reduced in length from 4m to 3.5m and would therefore satisfy the Council’s DC standard for residential extensions. It would not therefore adversely overshadow or have an overbearing impact.

No windows/openings are proposed in the flank wall of the extension, so views onto the neighbour would be oblique and unacceptable loss of privacy avoided.

The basement flat is underground, so would not be perceived by either neighbour. The terrace is sunken so would not cause overlooking onto either neighbour.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Exterior materials to match

Informative:

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? n/a

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 28-01-2015

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 28 January 2015