Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/0714/13** **Recommendation –** Approve

Site: 40 Cheal Close, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Front and rear extension and front extension to garage

Date of site visit: 13 August 2013

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings
The application relates to the eastern half of a pair of link-detached bungalows located on the north side of the road. The dwelling has an angled siting to the road where the application bungalow is further from the road than that of the bungalow to the east (No.38). The pair of link-detached dwellings both have attached flat-roofed garages which link in the middle of the pair, on the west side of the application bungalow.

Permission is sought for a rear pitched roof extension and a projecting front extension across the full width of the house and garage. The rear extension would measure 2.6 metres in depth and 4.15 metres wide and 3.9 metres in height to the ridge. There would be one window positioned in the west elevation.

As originally proposed the plans show that the front extension would follow the same roofline and width as the existing house and measure 3.75 metres in depth and with the linked garage extension following the line of the existing garage and porch but extending 2.1 metres forward of the existing garage. However amended plans have been received showing a staggered front elevation, having a 1 metre set back on the western side of the front extension and with the garage and hallway extension set slightly back from that.

Render, horizontal cladding and matching roof tiles are proposed.

Relevant site history

ADC/0387/08 Rear extension and west side extension (to rear of garage) approved September 2008

ADC/0477/09 Raising of ridge (by 1m) to form rooms in roof with side rooflights; pitch-roofed single-storey rear extension; and east side porch. Approved February 2010

AWDM/0881/11 Single storey extensions to front and rear elevations. Approved December 2011

Consultations

Adur & Worthing Councils: The Environmental Health Officer has recommended a precautionary contamination condition.

Representations
Two letters of representation from the occupiers if No. 1 Cheal Close, which is on the opposite side of the road, objecting to the application on the grounds that it extends almost to the pavement and would not be in keeping, leaving no room for parking and setting an undesirable precedent.

One letter of representation from the occupier of No.42 and a letter from the occupier of No.2 whose parents have recently purchased No.42, objecting to the application on the grounds of the proposed extension ruining the attractive uniform presentation/continuity, loss of light to the lounge of No.42

One letter of representation from a resident in Hopewell Close, which is not in the immediate vicinity of the site, objecting to the application on the grounds of the impact on the character of the area and the effect on light for the immediate neighbour.

Relevant Planning Policies
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' National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

The site is not identified as being potentially contaminated therefore an informative is considered sufficient to advise the applicant of any potential contamination.

Residential amenity

The attached bungalow at No. 42 is also served by a garage (link detached as described above) , and is separated at the rear from the application site boundary by 3.5m, and there is a 1.8m high fence with coniferous hedge. To the north are the properties in Riverside Road, located 22m away. To the east is No. 38 a similar styled gabled bungalow which is sited closer to the road than the application dwelling. It has, projecting to the rear, a flat roof rear extension which makes up part of the side boundary, and projects beyond the rear elevation of the existing bungalow at No.40 by 1.0m.

The previous permission allowed a 2.6m deep extension to the rear but it was larger than the current proposals, being more than 2 metres wider and 0.4 metres higher. The current proposals for a smaller extension would not pose any significant threat to residential amenity. If approved a condition to prevent any additional windows in the side elevations would ensure that there would be no significant loss of privacy and there is already adequate screening and separation to the west.

The rear gardens of the bungalows in Cheal Close are all relatively short, the application property being no exception at a length of 8.5 – 9.5m. Whilst the proposed rear extension would reduce the length of the garden, the reduction

in garden generally would be to a lesser extent than the previous permission where it was considered to be adequate, meeting the minimum standard as set out in the above Dev. Control Standard for a dwelling of this size (100sqm). The size of the proposals would not result in the bungalow appearing out of character or over developed for the surrounding area.

Turning to the impact of the front extension, the main section across the width of the bungalow would be well separated from the frontage of No.42. The garage extension, being closest to the side boundary, would have the main impact, but as this is adjacent to their own garage, set at least 2.5 metres away from the front window and limited in depth at this point, it is considered that, despite the concerns raised in the representations, there would be no significant impact in terms of loss of light or outlook to the occupiers of No. 42.

No.38 to the east has west facing windows which are currently positioned forward of the front wall of No.40. As was the case with the previous proposal, the extension would project beyond a window in the west side of No.38 towards the front of the bungalow, although the current application proposes continuing the ridge line of the existing bungalow. However it is considered that the additional height would not have a significant effect on outlook from ground floor windows as the bulk would be set well away. The 4.5m separation between the buildings would be enough to prevent an unacceptable loss of outlook or daylight in this case.

Visual amenity
The proposed front extension is larger than that previously permitted. The previous permission was for an extension to the eastern half of the front elevation measuring 3.8m in width, by 3.75m in depth and 3.7m in height to the apex of the roof. The previously approved extension was designed with a front gable and with windows in the south and west elevations. As the extension was across only half the width of the house approximately, the staggering effect, which is a feature in this street, was maintained. The extension across the full width of the house as originally proposed with the addition of the garage/porch extension would be much more prominent in the streetscene, compared with the previously approved scheme and would not maintain the staggered character. The concerns raised in the representations over the appearance and impact on the character are noted. However, revised plans have been received which reduce the depth of the western section of the front extension to allow for a 1 metre setback from the main front wall. Although a reduction in the overall depth would be preferable to maintain the staggering with No.38, the extension would be set back from the front wall of No.38 and the additional step in the front elevation would reduce the prominence of the western corner. The proposed extension would be screened from view from the east by the stepped alignment of the neighbouring bungalow (No.38). From the west, views of the extension would be seen in front of the backdrop of the same property.

The concerns in the representations from No.2 appear to be based on a misinterpretation of the plans. The extension would be set well back from the pavement. Adequate parking can be maintained to the frontage as there would be at least an 8m deep setback from the front boundary and a parking space within the garage.

Visually the proposed rear extension would be limited in its impact on the streetscene due to it being located to the rear. The proposed ridged roof profile of the extension would be sympathetic and would not harm the character of the recipient building or area in general.

Recommendation

Approve for the reason:-
The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) or the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit 3 years
2. Matching materials
3. No further side windows
4. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Drawing number 01 entitled 'Plans & Elevations as Existing' deposited 4 July 2013
   Drawing number 02 Rev A entitled 'Plans & Elevations as Proposed' deposited 13 September 2013
   Drawing number 03 Rev A entitled 'Block & Location Plan' deposited 13 September 2013

Informative:

- Contamination precaution
- The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

Case Officer: Rebekah Smith Date: 15 October 2013

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 17 October 2013