Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – Approve**
AWDM/0131/12

Site: **32 Middle Road, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex BN43 6GA**

Proposal: **Proposed part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension.**

Date of site visit: 02.02.12

Neighbours checked: Y

Proposal
The application property is a Victorian era mid-terraced house, with two-storey rear projection, and adjoined to the south an additional single-storey, mono-pitched extension. The house fronts onto Middle Road with a 1m set-back, and to the rear faces the Middle Road allotments.

Permission is sought for demolition of the existing single-storey extension and the erection of a part two-storey rear extension and a single-storey infill extension. The two storey element would attach directly to the rear of the existing two-storey 'outrigger' and would have the same footprint as the demolished extension, 2.5m deep by 3.1m wide, and would have a dual pitch roof, 6.5m in height. The single-storey element would infill part of the gap to the eastern boundary, and would have a sloping mono-pitch roof to the boundary with an eaves height of 2.5m. It would be 1.7m wide, by 4m deep.

To the east and west are similar style properties within the terrace. No.30 to the west has its two-storey 'outrigger' adjoined to that of the application site. It is also served by a single-storey extension to the rear, and has an obscurely glazed bathroom window at first floor facing south. To the east No.34 is of original design, with rear rooms facing south towards the garden between the two outriggers, and a kitchen window looking towards the site.

Relevant site history
None

Representations

Third Parties: There have been no third party objections to the proposals.

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'
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Visual amenity
The proposed extensions would be to the rear of the terraced property and therefore the impact on the appearance and character of the streetscene would be relatively limited. The rear of the terrace of properties are on view from the respective gardens and from further to the south in the community allotments. The proposed two storey and single-storey extensions are considered to be of sympathetic design, brick built with pitched tiled roofs, and would not therefore detract particularly from the appearance of the house.

Residential amenity
The proposed two-storey element would project 2.5m from the rear elevation of the existing outrigger, which would ordinarily be contrary to the above DC Standard's 2m. However in this case the attached dwelling (No.30) has an obscurely glazed bathroom window at first floor level, and it is considered that the impact on the outlook from this secondary room would therefore be limited. The south facing aspect would ensure that the impact on natural light would not be unacceptable.

The main concern is with the impact on the attached neighbour to the east (No.34). The above DC Standard states that where dwellings have been built with projecting sections it would not usually be acceptable to build an extension infilling the space between the projection and the boundary with an attached dwelling. This is because the property which was not extended would be left with rooms in a deep recess which would have a poor outlook and insufficient light.

In this example the Victorian dwellings have a higher floor level in the main section of the house, however floor levels in the outrigger are lower, and the garden lower still. There is an approximate height increase or 0.3m. As a result the outlook from the rear room of the attached property is higher above the existing 1.7m high boundary wall than would be usual. The amount of natural daylight is already restricted from the east and west due to the existing two-storey rear projections either side.

The applicant's agent has made compromises to the infill extension and reduced the overall height so that the eaves would be 2.5m in height, and the projection has been reduced to 4m. On the basis that the outlook from the main house of the attached property (No. 34), would still be from an elevated position (in relation to outside ground level), and that the extension would not project beyond the rear of the existing two-storey and single-storey elements, it is considered that, on balance, the impact on outlook and light would not be so much worse than existing that it would be unacceptable.

Recommendation

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 east or west side walls of the extensions etc
4. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Drawing No: 1:1250 Site location plan. Date Received:13.02.12
   Drawing No: 1:500 Block Plan. Date Received: 13.02.12
   Drawing No: 01.12.10. Date Received: 13.02.12
   Drawing No: 01.12.12. Date Received: 13.02.12
   Drawing No: 01.12.11.A. Date Received: 13.02.12
   Drawing No: 01.12.13.A. Date Received: 13.02.12
   Drawing No: 01.12.14. Date Received: 13.02.12

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

Case Officer: C. Hone Date: 16.03.12.

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 19 March 2011