Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1423/15 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 66 Gordon Road, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: First Floor extension to south elevation

Date of site visit: 2.11.15

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is a mid-terrace two storey character dwelling located within a street of similar dwellings. As is common with this style of property there is a recessed section and rear two storey projection. There is a lean-to single storey element to the rear. This would originally have encompassed the original bathroom/W.C and now forms part of the kitchen. The property has a long rear garden.

Permission is sought for a first floor extension to the rear. The extension will project from the existing rear projection above the existing single-storey part. The extension will form a gable extending to the south. It will provide an additional first floor bedroom what is the existing bathroom will form a walk through and en-suite. It is 3.15 metres wide and 2.8 metres deep. The height to the ridge is 5.65 metres. The plans show the guttering on the eastern side to overhang the boundary with no. 68. Certificate B has been submitted with notice served on the neighbour.

The plans show that the extension to be tile hung, as an alternative to the brick and render of the existing building. The plans state that the structure will be 'insulated timber stud frame walls with hung tiles for maximum internal space.'

Consultations: None undertaken.

Representations:

One letter of representation has been received from the owners of no. 64 Gordon Road the following points have been raised as an objection to the proposal.

- Any development on our neighbour plot has a considerable impact on our residential amenity.
- Properties designed with side return area that provides light to the rear bedroom, the rear sitting room and the kitchen dining room.
- The existing ground floor extension is out of keeping and affects light to the kitchen dining room and rear sitting room.

- The cumulative effect of the two extensions we object to as we will feel boxed-in in all the rooms at the back of the house.
- Loss of light, sitting room enclosed by a longer tunnel. Two kitchen windows will lose even more sight of the sky.
- The rear first floor bedroom will also suffer from tunnel affect.
- The extension will reduce the amount of light entering our window to an unreasonable degree.
- Unnneighbourly form of development, adversely affecting the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of the adjoining residential property, particularly by reason of the loss of light and overbearing effect.
- No. 66 will become a 4 bedroom property with a bathroom and shower room. This is over development.
- The proposed extension in conjunction with the existing extension, by reason of its size, would have an adverse impact on the scale and character of number 66.

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'
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012).

Planning Assessment

Principle

There is no objection in principle to the proposed development which involves an extension to an existing dwelling house. The main issues for consideration are the impact of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the dwelling and street scene and the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings.

Visual amenity

The proposed extension is to the rear of the dwelling, it would therefore not be visible within the street scene. The change in materials to tile hanging and gable end design is considered on balance to be acceptable in this case. The scale of the extension is limited and is not considered to be so detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling to warrant a refusal on design grounds in this case. The scale of the extension is appropriate and subservient in this case. This extension is an improvement upon the design of an existing flat roof, first floor addition within this row of terraces.

Residential amenity

As set out above an objection has been received from the owners of the adjacent dwelling at no. 64 Gordon Road, this is considered to be the main dwelling to be affected by the proposal. The case officer visited this property and assessed the impact of the proposal from the lounge/sitting room, rear bedroom and kitchen/ diner. Photographs were taken.

As existing there is a uPVC infill extension built up to the boundary at ground floor with no. 64. The two side kitchen/diner windows currently look out onto the side of the extension into the space at no. 64 adjacent to the boundary. It is considered that these windows receive limited outlook due to their side aspect and limited light as they face onto the side of the two storey projection at the application site also. The existing single storey extension does contribute to this however despite this these windows are impacted by the presence of the adjacent building as a whole, as originally built. It is acknowledged that the proposed two storey extension will impact this further however this impact is not considered to be such to warrant a refusal in this case. The kitchen/diner has south facing doors onto the garden which are the main outlook and source of light to the kitchen area. The side windows are secondary and receive limited light and outlook as existing.

Similarly the lounge/sitting room has a main bay to the front of the dwelling, through to the recessed rear sash window which is to the rear. Again there is limited light and aspect to the rear lounge window due to the recess and impact of the adjacent building, and extension. The further first floor addition will increase this impact, yet the main aspect and light source is to the front from the main bay. This impact is acknowledged however again a balanced view is taken that the impact is not such to justify a refusal in this case. The first floor bedroom which faces south has single aspect with a recessed window being at first floor, there is no impact upon light to this window as a result if the ground floor extension the only impact is the first floor projection. This is set in by 3 metres from the boundary, as will the proposed first floor extension. The impact is therefore considered to not be such to again justify refusal.

The existing situation is that of the original, traditional design of the terraces combined with the previous addition of the single storey infill extension and the first floor addition which is the subject of this application. It is not considered on balance to impact upon the light, outlook, aspect and enjoyment of the adjacent dwelling, no. 64 by its current and future occupiers to such a degree in addition to the existing impact to warrant a refusal in this case.

Consideration should also be given to the occupiers of the dwelling to the east no. 68. Adjacent to the proposed rear projection at first floor is a bathroom window, there would be no impact upon light to this room at a limited depth under 3 metres. Adjacent to the boundary at ground floor is a bathroom and store and there would be no adverse impact in this case.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 Year Time Limit

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:-

Drawing no. 05 – received 28th September 2015
Drawing no. 02 – received 28th September 2015
Drawing no. 01 – received 28th September 2015

Reason: *For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.*

3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015(or any Order amending revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows or other openings shall be formed in the east or west side wall of the extension.

   Reason: To prevent overlooking and to comply with saved policy AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan.

4. Roof tiles to match existing and tile-hanging of elevations using tiles of a similar colour.

Informative

1. Proactive Statement – No Amendments

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 24th November 2015

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 25.11.2015