Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/1161/13** **Recommendation –** Approve

Site: 3 Tarragon Way, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Construction of single storey rear extension

Date of site visit: 24 October 2013

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The site relates to a two storey semi-detached house located on the west side of Tarragon Way, close to its junction with Upper Shoreham Road to the south. This is a predominantly residential area comprising of similar houses in the immediate vicinity in Tarragon Way.

Permission is sought for the construction of a single storey extension to the rear elevation. The extension would measure approximately 3.5 metres in depth and 5.1 metres in width, aligning with the north wall of the house. The extension would have a flat roof measuring 2.9 metres in height and with a roof lantern above.

Matching materials are proposed.

Relevant site history
None relevant

Consultations
None relevant

Representations
None

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

Residential amenity
There is an existing conservatory to the rear of No.1 to the south of the application site that extends to a similar depth to the proposals in this case. A 2-2.5 metre evergreen hedge runs along the boundary at this side. Having

regard to this relationship, there would be no significant impact on the occupiers of No. 1 in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy.

The main impact would be to the occupiers of No.5 to the north of the site. No. 5 has no extensions at the rear and is set slightly forward (approximately 1 metre) of No. 3 so that the impact of the full depth of the proposed extension would be apparent. However, the extension would be set approximately 1.8 metres from the side of No.5 and there is a 1.8 m high (approx.) boundary fence between the two houses and the affected room at the rear of No.5 is also served by the front window. Despite the depth and site orientation, the separation distance and height of the proposed extension would limit the impact to an extent that a refusal would not be justified on amenity grounds, having regard to the relationship with the neighbouring dwelling. Subject to a condition preventing any side windows being installed the proposed extension is considered acceptable in terms of its impact on residential amenity.

Visual amenity
The proposed extension would be at the rear of the house where it would not be readily visible within the streetscene given the spacing between dwellings. The extension would be of an appropriate scale and design and subject to the use of matching materials, would not be harmful to the visual amenities of the site or surrounding area.

Recommendation

Approve for the reason:-
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 National Planning Policy Framework.

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit 3 years
2. Matching materials
3. No side windows
4. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Drawing Number 01 entitled ‘Plans and Elevations as Existing’ deposited 13 September 2013
   Drawing Number 02 entitled ‘plans and Elevations as Proposed’ deposited 13 September 2013
   Drawing Number 03 entitled ‘Location Plan’ and ‘Block Plan’ deposited 13 September 2013

Informative:

- 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.

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

Case Officer: Rebekah Smith Date: 26 November 2013

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 26 November 2013