# Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: AWDM/0126/15 Recommendation – APPROVE**

**Site: 10 The Close, Shoreham-By-Sea**

**Proposal: Ground floor rear extension; hip to gable roof extension; first floor extension above garage and to rear incorporating new pitched roof; front porch projection**

**Date of site visit:** 10-3-2015
**Neighbours checked: Y**
**Additional neighbour notifications: N**

**Proposal, Site and Surroundings**

The application site is a two storey semi-detached dwelling in a residential street close to Shoreham town centre. The attached dwelling at No.8 has been extended with a part hipped side gable and two storey flat roof side extension, and a front extension.

Permission is sought for a hip-to-gable roof extension, a single storey front extension and two storey side extension, and single storey rear extension, to measure in entirety 9.5 metres in width, 8.4 metres in height, and 12 metres in length.

A large rear dormer previously proposed has now been omitted from the application.

**Consultations:** None

**Representations (summarised):**
Objections from occupiers of 9 and 1 Windlesham Gardens: *would seriously affect privacy in our garden and that of our neighbours. Addition of full second floor with conventional casement windows allows full views of our garden and private space. Out of keeping with character of house and neighbourhood. Appears more suited to an intense urban environment and not a suburban one. New owners presumably bought the property for, amongst other things, its character and its surroundings. This proposal is ugly. Velux windows on easterly elevation much more acceptable solution and preferred solution on westerly elevation. Even so, detailed examination of design and materials is necessary in order to draw a firmer conclusion. Overdevelopment. Request a visit by case officer. Too large.*

**Relevant Planning Policies**
Saved Adur District Local Plan: AG1, AH7
National Planning Policy Framework

**Planning Assessment**

***Principle***

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle

***Visual amenity***

The proposed front and side extensions would be visible in the street scene. These elements would be finished in matching exterior materials and finishes, with roof shape and form sympathetic to the main house.

As there is no regimented spacing to the mix of housing stock design in the street, the loss of spacing between 10 and 12 The Close would not be harmful in itself. The side extension is visually subservient to the main house to avoid the enlarged building appearing out of scale with other surrounding buildings.

The balance of the pair of 10 and 8 has already been lost with the extensions built out at 8. The works would make this unbalance no worse.

Having regard to this context, the proposed extensions would be acceptable in terms of their impact on the visual amenity of the site and surroundings.

***Residential amenity***

The neighbours principally impacted upon by this development are those at the rear and to either side.

*Neighbours at rear*

Sufficient distance would be retained between the works and neighbouring buildings at the rear so as to avoid adverse overbearing and overshadowing.

For the same reason, intrusive overlooking and unacceptable loss of privacy would be avoided. There is mutual overlooking of the gardens of these neighbouring properties.

*Neighbour to north (12)*

The proposed works are sufficiently removed from this neighbouring building so as to avoid harmful overbearing and overshadowing.

The absence of windows/openings in the north elevation of the proposal ensures overlooking would be oblique in its nature, and therefore the potential for adverse overlooking and unacceptable loss of privacy is negated.

*Neighbour to south (8)*

This neighbouring building has itself been extended at the rear by way of a single-storey. The proposed extension at No. 10 would protrude a similar length to match this extension, and would be of a similar height.

For this reason no adverse impact in terms of overbearing/overshadowing/loss of privacy would occur.

**Recommendation**

**APPROVE**
**Subject to Conditions:**

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved Plans
3. Materials to match
4. No windows/openings at first floor in north side

**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? N**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Case Officer: | Matthew Porter | Date: 25-03-2015 |
| Authorised by: | Peter Barnett | Date: 26 March 2015 |