Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1961/17 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 122 Gordon Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Single Storey Rear Extension

Date of site visit: 22nd January 2018

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a two storey semi detached dwelling within a street of similar properties. Consent was originally sought for a single storey flat roof rear extension. This extension was greater than the full width of the dwelling overhanging by 0.8 metres and was shown as 6.3 metres in depth it was of flat roof design and 3 metres in height. The original plans showed there to be roof overhang to the rear and rear timber decking. It was considered that the large depth combined with width of the proposal had a detrimental impact upon the residential amenities of the adjacent occupiers. The excessive footprint was also out of scale and character with the existing semi detached dwelling.

Negotiations were carried out to discuss a reduction of the proposal to reduce the impact upon neighbours with regards to loss of light and overbearing impact. Both, no. 124 attached and no. 120 to the west were considered to be impacted by the proposal as originally submitted.

Amended plans have been received which show a reduction in depth of the extension to 3.5 metres adjacent to the attached neighbouring dwelling. 2.5 metres from the boundary the extension steps out to 6 metres for the remainder of the width of the dwelling only. The roof overhang has been removed and the timber decking is shown to be less than 300mm therefore does not require consent here. The extension will provide a utility shower/w.c room and an open plans dining living space. The height is 2.9 metres with a flat roof. The amended plans are for consideration here. A supporting statement has also been submitted with the amended plans stating that due to the needs of the family the front sitting room will be used as a bedroom to care for relatives and also to provide a more accessible bedroom than those at first floor. Therefore the rear extension provides living space required for this family of four dealing with an ongoing condition.

Representations

1 representation received from attached neighbour no. 124 Gordon Road. This objection was received in response to the original plans, no further representations have been made following the readvertising of the amended plans: -

- The effect of the development would be like having a whole new property being built right next to our patio area. Living room glass doors are just 1 metre away from the boundary.

- The proposed extension is so large at more than double the footprint of the existing ground floor and close in proximity that it will feel over bearing viewed from our side.

- Setting back the extension from the boundary would still leave the neighbours a sizeable extension.

- How can they safely build the extension without potential of damaging our fencing or house. The boundary fence is to keep the dogs in and people out it cannot be damaged.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading 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 to the rear of the dwelling, the amended plans have reduced the width to be in line with the side of the existing dwelling. The extension is therefore not visible from the front of the dwelling within the street scene. Although the extension still has a large footprint, relative to the ground floor of the original dwelling, it is on balance considered to be acceptable. The plot is deep with a large rear garden, the proposal is not considered to represent over development in this case, in the light of the amendments reducing the neighbour impact, and taking account of the particular needs of the family.

Materials to be used are contemporary in style with vertical timber weather boarding to the external walls and grey doors. Three sky lights are also proposed in the flat roof. The applicant's agent has provided details of the cladding stating it is Lark which is of a natural finish which will weather over time.

Residential amenity

The main concern here was the impact upon the adjacent neighbours. The attached neighbour no. 124 has a boundary fence which exists between the properties. The extension will be higher than this fence and will be visible,

however adjacent to the neighbour the depth is limited to 3.5 metres. The Council's Development Management Standards state that in cases such as this an extension should be limited to 3.5 metres to avoid loss of light and overbearing impact. It is considered therefore that this relationship is acceptable. The extension then steps out to 6 metres, however this is 2.5 metres away from the boundary. It is not considered that this increased depth will impact upon the attached neighbour.

The plans show the side of the extension facing onto the neighbour to be 'fair faced concrete blockwork wall' not the timber cladding as with the rest of the building. This is due to practical reasons in relation to building in close proximity to the boundary and maintenance. The applicant's agent has submitted a photograph of this finish to ensure it appears acceptable when viewed from the neighbour. It shows a smooth, cream/ivory finish similar to that of painted block work. A condition is attached to ensure this finish is used.

To the west is a semi detached property of different style which is narrower and deeper than the application site. It is set back into the site and also has a rear conservatory extension, increasing its depth. There is a small kitchen window facing east toward the side of the application site. There is also a rear door serving this room yet this is enclosed by the existing rear conservatory. This room therefore currently receives little light and outlook. This is both due to the current layout of the dwelling but also the use of window dressings which do not maximise the limited light available. The extension as amended, both in width and depth does improve the impact upon this property. Yet there is still some impact to the side kitchen window. However, on balance, considering the limited light already existing due to the layout and the heavy window dressings, the needs of the adjacent occupiers and increased spacing from the boundary, it is considered that the proposal as amended can be supported. It is not considered that the impact upon the light received by this window is such to warrant a refusal in this case on this ground only.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials to be as shown on approved plans including Lark timber cladding and fair faced concrete blockwork wall to side boundary in accordance with email dated 20th Feb 2018. Work shall be carried out in accordance with such details and shall remain as such unless otherwise approved in writing by the LPA.
4. No openings on east or west side of the extension.

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

1. Proactive with amendments.

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 20th February 2018

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 22 February 2018