Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0639/17 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 24 East Meadway, Shoreham-by-Sea, BN43 5RF

Proposal: Single storey rear extension and enlargement of existing rear dormer.

Date of site visit: 20.07.2017

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings: Middle of terrace bungalow, render colour wash finish, has small dormer in the rear roof. Neighbouring properties have extremely large dormers, to the full width of the roofs, and built off the existing wall plates; the end of the terrace, no. 28 has a high eaves single storey flat roof rear extension

The locality is residential comprising a mix of single and two storey dwellings, with predominantly single storey in the wider area.

Proposal

Permission is sought for a flat roof rear dormer and a single storey rear extension. The extension being positioned very close to the boundary with the neighbouring property no. 22 East Meadway.

The dormer will measure some 4.7m wide x 2.3m deep x 2.4m high and the extension will measure approx. 4.2m wide x 3.0m deep x 3.1m high

Consultations:

Environmental Health: Pollution Control

Precautionary condition plus PFA informative

Representations: Letter of support from 22 East Meadway.

- *I have seen the plans no objection to the extension*
- *I am aware of the height of the extension, and know that this will not block the light from my bedroom*
- *I am aware that one wall of the extension will be very close to the boundary which I am happy with*
- *The proposed application was discussed with the Applicant at great length before any plans were submitted*
- *Would like to point out that we had planned for the work to start on Friday and would hope that this date is not missed*

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Submission Adur Local Plan 2016: Policy 15
Development Control 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 the proposed extension which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The neighbouring terrace properties to the west, no.'s 26 and 28, have both undertaken the provision of very large rear dormers, filling each of their rear roofslopes. Therefore the proposed enlargement of the existing dormer on the rear roofslope, the proposed rear dormer will not be as wide as the neighbouring dormers, and therefore will look more appropriate on the rear roofslope than its neighbours. The dormer will not be out of keeping.

The rear extension will not be as high as that at no. 28, and it will be stepped off of the boundary to no. 26 in order to provide them with their right of way over the applicants land. However, it comes up very close to the boundary with no. 22, who has a rear window on their rear elevation which would suffer a degree of overshadowing by the proposed extension which will be some 3.1m high. The extension thereby will be some 1.1m higher than the 2m fence, and will have some impact onto the neighbouring property. However, they have written it and stated that they are fully aware of the application and its height and close proximity to their boundary and raise no objections to it.

Residential Amenity

The extension is located wholly at the rear and would have no impact on the street-scene

The neighbouring properties to the east (no. 26) and west (no. 22) will be the ones which would be most affected by the proposal.

The rear dormer will not be as dominant as its neighbouring dormer and being stepped away from both neighbouring properties, it will not result in any loss of amenity to the adjoining properties. There is a property to the rear no. 17 The Marlinespike which is a dormered bungalow, and the distance between the proposed dormer and the dormer of the rear property is approx. 20m, which is considered to be of a distance so as not to result in any unacceptable overlooking.

The extension is shown to be some 700mm from the boundary with no. 26, and it is considered that this distance is enough so as to largely prevent unacceptable overshadowing or overbearing onto that property.

However, with regard to no. 22, the extension as proposed is very close to the boundary with that property and there is a bedroom window on their rear elevation which would be affected by the proposal in terms of loss of light and outlook. The proposed extension is to the east of this window and will have an overshadowing effect principally in the mornings. It is not known if the room is question has an alternative aspect or source of daylight/sunlight, although it is noted that property is larger than the application property. The occupier of No.22 has written in a letter of support to state that they are aware of the proposed positioning and height of the extension and they do not raise any objections to it. The application should be considered on its merits and the fact that the neighbour supports the proposals should not determine the outcome of the application. However, also of some relevance in this case, is the 'fall-back' positon where an extension to the same depth as that proposed here could be built without an application for planning permission (albeit subject to the proviso that the height of the eaves should not exceed the height of the existing eaves).

The impact on No.22 is on the very margins of acceptability, however, all things considered, it is considered, on balance, refusal is not warranted in this case.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to the following conditions.

1. Approved plans
2. Standard time limit
3. Materials to match existing
4. No windows in the side elevations of the dormer or the rear extension

Informative

1. Approved without amendments
2. Contamination
3. PFA

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

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date 22.08.2017

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 22.08.2017

PLEASE HELP YOURSELVES TO VICTORIA PLUMS.

NOTE, I HAVE GROWN THEM AS ORGANICALLY AS NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES WILL ALLOW SO THERE MIGHT BE A WORM IN THE CENTRE, SO SUGGEST YOU CUT THEM OPEN FIRST. MY DAUGHTER COULD NOT BE BOTHERED WITH THAT AND SAID IF THERE WAS A WORM IT TASTED JUST LIKE THE PLUMS