Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0951/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 14 Kingston Broadway Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 6TE

Proposal: Single-storey rear extension to north elevation and removal of integral garage door and replace with window to front (south) elevation in connection with use of garage as habitable room.

Date of site visit: 25.08.2016

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a detached 1950's house with an integral garage occupying a corner plot on the west side of the junction of Kingston Broadway with Mulberry Close. There is no record of any previous extensions.

Adjoining to the west, No.16 comprises a semi-detached dwelling of a similar age. The latter has been enlarged by a single-storey rear extension. There is a drive on the east side of the dwelling which leads to a detached garage set back into the rear garden.

Adjoining on rising ground to the north is a detached, gabled-fronted bungalow fronting the west side of Mulberry Close. A Certificate of Lawfulness has recently been issued for a side dormer on the southern roof-slope (AWDM/0679/16).

Proposal

Permission is sought to erect a single-storey rear addition, extending both elements of the staggered rear elevation by 3m (to retain a staggered elevation). It would be 3.3m high with a predominantly flat roof and tiled 'skirt' around the edges.

In addition, permission is sought to convert the integral garage to a habitable room, replacing the garage door with a new bay window.

Relevant Planning History: None.

Consultations:

Southern Water: An informative is requested advising the applicant that a formal application for connection to the public sewerage system will be required. Due to change in legislation which came into effect on1 Oct 2011 regarding the future

ownership of sewers it is possible that a sewer now deemed as public crosses the site. Should any sewer be found during construction an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its condition, the number of properties it serves and potential means of access, before any further works commence. The applicant is advised to discuss the matter with Southern Water.

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (WBC 2003): AG1, AH7
SPG DC 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 upgrading the existing housing stock within the established built up area. The key issues are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The proposed rear extension is reasonably modest in size and has been designed to respect the scale and proportions of the original dwelling. It will not be prominently visible in public view, being largely screened by fencing which encloses the rear garden. [This fencing has recently been erected and would have required an application for planning permission although Google Streetview indicates it replaced an earlier close-boarded fence above the wall, similar if not taller in height.]

The front-projecting, flat-roofed element of the integral garage is an unusual feature but appears to be original. The proposed bay window would not exactly replicate the proportions of the existing window within the double bay, which is the main feature that articulates the front of the dwelling. The proposed bay could be considered an overly fussy feature that visually competes with the latter. However, in itself it is a relatively modest element that would not justify refusal.

Residential Amenity

The only affected properties are those adjoining to the north and west, No.1 Mulberry Close and 16 Kingston Broadway.

The proposed rear extension will be constructed on lower ground compared to No.1 Mulberry Close. Moreover, there is an electricity sub-station separating the properties. There will be an overall distance in excess of 12m between the southern flank of No.1 and the nearest part of the proposed rear extension. Consequently it is considered there would be no adverse impact in terms of loss of light or outlook. There effect of overlooking from the rear openings in the extension will not be substantially worse than the existing situation. It is worth noting that the requirements

of the GPDO require the windows in the south side dormer currently under construction at No.1 to be obscurely-glazed.]

The narrow gap that exists between the flank of the existing house and the west side boundary will be replicated to the west side of the proposed rear extension. Adjoining the site boundary is the driveway and garage belonging to No.16. In view of the separation distance involved there would be no adverse impact on the amenities of No.16 either resulting from the proposed rear extension or the conversion of the integral garage.

Other Matters

There is adequate space on the frontage of No.14 to accommodate 3 or 4 vehicles. Consequently there is no objection to the loss of garage parking on highway safety grounds (bearing in mind on-street parking in Kingston Broadway is restricted by yellow lining).

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. 3-yr time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Matching materials
4. No windows in west side of extension
5. Notwithstanding the detail shown on the approved drawing the existing brick-on-edge course above the garage door shall be retained as a window head and the new bay window provided with a cill to match the existing brick cills in this elevation.

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.

Southern Water

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 26.08.2016

Authorised by: PD Date: 30.8.16