Expiry Date – 27/3/17

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0122/17 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 12 Shingle Road, Shoreham

Proposal: **Demolition of existing conservatory and construction of single storey rear extension with pitched roof.**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 3/3

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a semi detached two storey 60's house on the east side of Shingle Road close to the junction with Harbour Way.

The property has been extended to the rear with a conservatory.

The property is not in a conservation area and is not listed. There are no protected trees on the site.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought to add a ground floor rear extension to this houses in place of the existing conservatory. The proposed extension measures 7 metres in depth, 4.8 metres wide and has a pitched roof with a maximum height of 3.6 metres.

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/0408/17 - Householder application for permitted development for prior approval for single-storey extension to rear of property measuring 6ms from rear wall of the original house, maximum height 4ms and height of eaves of the extension 3ms. Prior Approval Not Required 25.4.17

Consultations

Health: Precautionary asbestos condition and PFA informative required.

Representations

None received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012
Saved Adur Local Plan policies: AG1 and AH7 and Development Control Standard No. 3 - Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.
Emerging Adur Local plan policies: P2 and P15

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development can be supported as it upgrades a dwelling within the built up area boundary. Of primary consideration are the impact of the extension on neighbour amenity and the appearance of the area.

Neighbour Impact

The extension is well removed from the shared boundary with No. 10 and will have no impact on their amenity.

No. 14, to the north, is unextended at the rear. Adjoining the boundary it has a WC window and a separate utility room window. The dining room French doors are 2.5 metres off the shared boundary. The boundary is defined by fencing and trellis with plants growing to an approximate height of 2 metres.

Policy AH7

'Extensions and alterations to existing houses and bungalows will be expected to be designed so that:-
(a) proposals would not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, loss of natural light or overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings;
(b) design and materials are sympathetic to both the original dwelling and the area in general;
(c) the proportion of the garden area taken by the proposal would not be excessive having regard to the character of the area;
(d) access and car parking provision is acceptable under Policy AT12, and
(e) it accords with the standards adopted by the District Planning Authority.'

Para 3.2 of Development Control Standard 3 Extensions and Alterations to Dwelling states:

'The closer a rear extension is to the boundary of a neighbouring property the more likely it is to adversely affect that property, by way of overlooking or loss of daylight. On semidetached or terraced dwellings single-storey rear extensions which abut, or are within 1m of a common side boundary with an attached dwelling, should normally be no deeper than 3.5m.'

Para 3.5 states:

A rear extension should allow the retention of a rear garden of at least 11m depth (between the rear wall of the extension and the rear boundary of the property) and of adequate area.

It is considered that the extension will be harmful to the sunlight received to the rear of No. 14 and to its most intimate private garden area as it is due south of No.14. It is also considered that it will harm the outlook from the house and garden at No. 14 as it runs for over half the length of the rear garden boundary.

Notwithstanding the lack of objection from the occupiers of No. 14 and the larger household extension application allowed under permitted development at 6 metres deep it is still considered that this proposal at 7 metres will be harmful to neighbour amenity and is contrary to adopted Council policy and guidance.

Recommendation REFUSE for the following conditions:

The depth, height and proximity of the proposed extension in relation to No. 14 Shingle Road will have a harmful impact on occupiers due to a loss of light and outlook and overbearing impact. The proposal is contrary to saved local plan policy AH7, Development Control Standard No. 3 - Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings, emerging local plan policy 15 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative

1. 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.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 3/5/17
Authorised and signed by:	PD	Date: 3.5.17