Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1435/15 Recommendation – Approve

Site: 37 Gordon Road, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Part retrospective application for single storey timber clad rear extension

Date of site visit: 16 October 2015

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a mid-terrace house on the north side of Gordon Road. Construction has commenced on a single storey rear extension which measures 3.6m deep, 3.4m wide and 3.4m high at its highest point. It has a monopitched roof with the lowest point (2.7m high) abutting the house, sloping up to the highest point furthest from the house. It is to be finished in non-matching materials; namely, clad in timber boarding with a fibreglass (GRP) roof.

Relevant site history

None

Consultations

None

Representations

1 letter of objection received from the occupier of 35 Gordon Road:-

- Square design is very obtrusive in that it is too high
- Extends beyond objector's house and will block light
- Appearance and materials are out of character with street of Victorian houses

Relevant Planning Policies

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' National Planning Policy Framework (March 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.

The extension has replaced an original lean-to extension at the rear which was 1.3m deep. The extension beyond the original rear wall is therefore 2.3m. The applicant contends that it is permitted development in terms of its dimensions but the height of the eaves, if measured at the highest point exceeds 3m. The CLG technical guidance for householders advises that "Eaves height is measured from ground level at the base of the outside wall to the point where that wall would meet the upper surface of the roof slope - the overhang should be ignored for the purposes of measurement." It could be argued therefore that the eaves height is actually the lowest point of the roof where it abuts the house, which is less than 3m. The overall height of the extension is less than 4m. However, materials do not match existing. Permission is therefore required.

Visual amenity

The design of the extension is unusual in that the roof slopes up from the rear wall of the house so the highest point is furthest from the house. This results in a taller vertical wall than would be the case if it had a traditionally designed sloping roof, which is more common in the vicinity of the site.

The use of timber boarding as an external finish for the walls does not match the materials used in the original house and would also be out of keeping with the more traditional use of brick found elsewhere in the street.

Nevertheless, the extension is at the rear of the dwelling and is not visible from the street. It is a relatively modest addition which is only marginally deeper in projection that the neighbouring extensions to the east and west. In terms of scale, it is considered to be appropriate.

While the design and use of materials is not in keeping with other lean-to extensions at the rear of these dwellings, it is not considered that sufficient visual harm will arise in the wider area to warrant a refusal of the application. On balance, it is considered to be acceptable.

Residential amenity

The extension projects beyond the rear wall of the extension on the attached house to the west by approximately 0.6m. The boundary is formed by a closeboard fence with an ivy covered structure above which provides a partial screen to the neighbour. It is not considered that the extension will cause a significant loss of light or outlook for the neighbour to the west.

To the east, the neighbouring dwelling has a rear single storey extension with a blank side wall. A window is proposed in the side of the extension which

would have clear views across the low boundary wall towards the neighbouring house. It is considered that a condition should be imposed to require the window to be obscure glazed in the interests of amenity.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Materials to be as specified
2. Obscure glaze east side window
3. Permission relates to approved plans

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

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 3 November 2015

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 3 November 2015