Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – Approve**
AWDM/0998/12

Site: **69 Beach Green, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex, BN43 5YE**

Proposal: **First floor rear extension**

Date of site visit: 4 July 2012 and 4 September 2012

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a detached house on the south side of Beach Green. It has been previously extended at the rear with a flat-roofed single storey extension measuring 3.6m deep. The application is proposing a first floor extension over this existing extension measuring, as amended, 2.8m deep. A new pitched roof is proposed over the remaining area of flat roof on the ground floor. This replaces the original proposal for an extension over the full depth of the ground floor with first floor door opening and Juliet balcony. The amended plans now contain a conventional window at first floor. Materials are to match the existing dwelling, with white cladding at the sides and front.

Relevant site history

None

Consultations

None

Representations

Original Plans – 2 letters of objection received from the occupiers of 67 and 71 Beach Green on the following grounds:

- Overdevelopment which protrudes beyond existing ground floor extension at No.71
- Will be the only first floor extension at the rear of this line of properties and will be out of character
- Balcony and full length window will intrude into privacy of garden at No.71
- Materials should match
- Loss of light to No.67

The application was also called-in for consideration by the Planning Committee by Cllr McKinney

Amended Plans – 1 letter received from the occupiers of 71 Beach Green withdrawing their objection

Cllr McKinney also withdrew her call-in request

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'
South East Plan (GOSE 2009): CC1, CC6, BE1
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading of the existing housing stock 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 dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

The extension is at the rear of the dwelling and will not be visible in the street scene. It is a modest addition which will not dominate the existing dwelling or be unduly out of character with neighbouring dwellings. There is an example of a similar extension at No.73 to the west.

Residential amenity

The extension has been reduced in size from its original submission, with its depth reduced and a proposed Juliet balcony removed. The resulting impact on neighbouring occupiers is therefore not considered to be harmful. The extension will be in line with the rear wall of the ground floor extension at No.71, rather than project beyond, and at 2.8m deep it will not form a significant overbearing feature or cause a harmful loss of light to ground or first floor rooms at No.71. The use of white cladding to match existing will give the extension a lighter appearance and reflect light towards No.71. The removal of the Juliet balcony and full length doors at first floor will also reduce the extent of any overlooking to an acceptable degree.

To the east, No.67 is 10m from the extension and is not considered to be adversely affected by the proposal.

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 South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1)

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Materials to match existing dwelling etc
3. No windows or other openings in side walls of the extension etc
4. Permission relates to approved plans:

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

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 29 October 2012

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 30 October 2012