Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1549/15 **Recommendation – Approve**

Site: 57 The Crescent

Proposal: Single-storey side and rear extension

Date of site visit: 10-11-15

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a semi-detached inter-war two-storey dwellinghouse that has been extended by way of a hip-to-gable roof extension and a rear dormer (recent permitted development work).

The proposal is for a 'wrap around' side and rear extension with a shallow roof (the full details of which are shown on the submitted drawings).

Relevant site history
None relevant

Consultations (summarised)
Southern Water: *add informative*

Representations (summarised)
Objection received from occupier of 59 The Crescent: *Very strongly object. So close to boundary that it impossible for me to have an extension myself of a reasonable size because the foundations will no doubt extend into my property. Massive loss of light to my back room because it is so close to the boundary. Judging by size, don't think it unreasonable of me to ask side wall be moved at least 300mm in from position they are proposing. This would make it possible for me to have an extension.*

Relevant Planning Policies
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
Adur District Local Plan saved policies: AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of existing housing stock is supported in principle.

Visual amenity

The extension is domestic in its scale and proportionate to the rest of the building, with matching eaves and ridge. It roof is shallow but this makes it subservient visually.

There is a slight set in from the front wall to ensure the extension is distinguishable from the main house as a later addition.

The new fenestration is poorly proportioned at the front (it should be smaller than the principal bay window at ground floor) however, it is sufficiently similar to that on the existing building to avoid being viewed as obtrusive.

The extension would be built of matching exterior materials and finishes.

Residential amenity

It is neighbours to either side who are principally impacted upon by this development (it is physically removed from the remainder).

Physically adjoining neighbour to east

This neighbouring building exhibits a pair of French doors with side lights close to the shared boundary, serving a lounge. A single-storey flat roof rear extension has been built alongside, off the outside wall.

The proposed extension would reduce outlook and daylight and sunlight received by the neighbour's lounge. However, this window is already compromised by the neighbour's own extension, and the new extension would not protrude beyond this.

So although a 'tunnelling' of sorts would result, the compounded overbearing and overshadowing effects would not be of such severity as to be materially harmful compared to the present situation.

The applicant has amended the scheme to comply with the neighbour's request for a 300mm set in from the shared boundary.

Windows/openings are absent in the extension flank facing this neighbour, negating potential unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy. View from the rear fenestration of the extension would be oblique.

Adjacent neighbour to west

The shared drive separates this neighbouring building from the proposed extension, which would negate the potential for adverse overshadowing.

This distance, together with the angle of the pitched roof, would avoid harmful overbearing.

Windows/openings in the extension flank facing this neighbour are kept to a minimum and would be screened by existing boundary treatment - negating the potential of unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy. View from the rear fenestration of the extension would be oblique.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved Plans
3. Exterior materials to match

Informative:

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

Case Officer: Matthew Porter Date: 7-12-2015

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 8 December 2015

Drawing No. PBP0367/02A titled SITE LOCATION PLAN date received 27-11-2015
Drawing No. PBP0367/03A titled BLOCK PLAN date received 27-11-2015
Drawing No. PBP0367/01B REV B titled SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION date received 27-11-2015