Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0801/22 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 18 Longshore Drive, Shoreham-by-Sea, BN43 6DJ

Proposal: Proposed single storey rear extension

Date of site visit: Assessment has been assisted using the Applicants plans; Earthlight mapping; and Google 3D of the site

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings:

The site is located on the south west of Longshore Drive and is a link attached, 2½ storey dwelling, the link being a double garage attached to no.'s 18 and 20 Longshore Drive.

Longshore Drive is within a very recent new build, and comprises a mixture of terrace and semi-detached dwellings; plus there are also blocks of flats.

Proposal:

This application seeks planning permission to add a single storey rear extension with a mono-pitch roof, across the full width of the dwelling (including to the rear of the garage.

The depth of the extension from the dwelling is shown as 3m on the north elevation and 2.1m on the south elevation. The width is shown as 8.362m. The height of the false pitched roof will be approx. 2.9m high.

Representations: Amended Plans: 1no. letter of objection from no.16 Longshore Drive:

- Note that the height of the pitched roof has been reduced and has partially been replaced with a flat roof, but the height is not shown;
- Need to know the height to avoid future misunderstandings;
- The reduction to 3m is still too much as it abuts the boundary and our garden is very narrow;
- Still does not conform to the 45° guideline and based on this we calculate the extension should be no more than 2.6m deep;
- At 2.6m it will reduce but not remove the loss of light and overall impact on us;
- The extension at no. 53 is 2.6m and the neighbouring extension should be the same

Original Plans: 1no. letter of objection from no.16 Longshore Drive:

- Neighbours did not discuss their proposal before submitting;
- Extension will have a severe adverse effect on our enjoyment of our house and garden;
- Detrimental effect as if directly abuts the common boundary with our property;
- The height will be 3.5m and it will be 3.5m deep, and will be 1.5m from our window. It will dominate our outlook;
- The roof height will be overbearing on our living space;
- Although within guidelines of the SPG, it is within the 45^0 line from our ground floor window;
- The extension is to the south east of our property, and therefore it will result in overshadowing;
- The width of our garden is 4.5m, therefore the proposal will be overbearing and oppressive to us;
- A flat roof would improve the negative impact;
- Likely the resultant garden will be at variance to the SPG guidelines;
- Should convert the garage if more space required;
- Would set a precedent;
- Would create a tunnel effect if other neighbour constructed a rear extension also;
- Other extension on nearby property is a good example.

Relevant History: None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 1, 15
Supplementary Planning Guidance comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework 2021

Planning Assessment

Principle:

The proposal comprises upgrading a residential property 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 surrounding area.

Visual & Residential Amenity:

No. 18 is a link terraced property, by reason of having an attached side garage which is joined to the neighbouring (no. 20) properties attached side garage. The site is within a new housing estate, and properties within the estate do vary but in the main are generally terraced.

Although the Adur SPG reasons that 3.5m is a generally acceptable depth for a rear extension, it has been considered in this instance that because of the neighbouring property at no. 16 (north west of the application site), has a narrow rear garden,

measuring on the Earthlight plans to be 5m wide (although the occupant reports it as being 4.5m wide), a depth of 3m would be more appropriate.

It is a reasonable consideration that the property at no. 18 is allowed to construct an extension to their property provided it is of reasonable proportions. In this case the application has been amended to reduce the height and depth of the extension and it is now 3m in depth and approx. 2.9m in height, the roof being flat with a false pitch at the front section, this pitch will of course be lower than the flat roof section.

The 3m deep rear extension will also accord with permitted development rights as outlined within the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended. Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of that Order stipulates the depth of a rear extension that would be considered permitted development, and that depth is 3m for a terraced dwelling. The current proposal is thereby considered an acceptable depth.

The amended plans have also reduced the height of the extension down from 3.6m on the original submission to 2.9m in height. Again, this is considered a reasonable height given that Building Regulations now require a 'warm roof' i.e. the insulation within the roofspace has now been increased. Thereby in order to have adequate standing height within any room constructed, and the warm roof, the height of the proposal could not be reduced any further.

The 45° guideline cited by the neighbouring property, is not a government guideline nor local policy but is a good rule of thumb. In this case, the neighbouring property has 4no. glazed floor to ceiling height windows/doors in the centre of the ground floor and it is considered that they will continue to receive adequate light and outlook. The extension at No.53 referred to by the objector was submitted at 2.6m and was not specifically requested by the LPA to be at that depth. It is not considered to have set a precedent as each application must be considered on its individual merits. In this case, the application has been amended to reduce the depth from 3.5m to 3m and has lowered the height. On balance, the impact on No. 16 is considered to be acceptable.

The neighbouring property to the south east, no. 20, has an adjoining garage with the application site, and that garage protrudes to the rear of the dwelling. Thereby, no.20 will not be adversely affected by the proposal.

There are no dwellings abutting the rear of the application site, but a car parking area instead.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard time limit

3. Materials
4. Windows

Informatives:-

1. Approved following amendment

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

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 21.09.2022

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 21 September 2022