Expiry Date – 30/6 ppa agreed to 10/7

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0675/20 Recommendation – Grant

Site: 21 River Close, Shoreham

Proposal: **Single storey extension to rear.**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 5/6 and 19/6

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a linked 3 storey semi detached house at the very eastern end of River Close. The property has the appearance of a two storey house from the rear and three storeys from the front. The ground floor at the rear is raised above garden level, 900mm. The site's east side boundary abuts the rear garden boundary of houses set at right angles on Beach Green, 28-32 (even). Beyond the site's rear garden fence are high conifer trees. The rear garden extends into this area. Beyond the site's northern boundary are house boat occupiers' gardens. These gardens are at the same level as the site garden but considerably lower than the recent tidal wall works, pedestrian walkway and river boats themselves.

The site is not in a conservation area and is not listed.

Proposal

Planning permission was initially submitted for a first floor side extension over the garage and a single storey rear extension. The ground floor extension was also to have a high chimney in it. The chimney and the first floor extension have been removed from the proposal.

The property already has a rear extension and has built a garage on its east side. It is proposed to extend to the rear of the garage and to the full depth of the rear garden along the eastern boundary. This includes beyond the existing northern boundary fence which is part of the site and involves the removal of several conifers. Because of the rear raised ground floor level the link extension element to the existing rear extension has a sloping roof from the existing extension's roof down to meet the roof of the new rear extension. On the boundary with No. 28 the extension has an eaves height of 2.15 metres and a maximum height of 3 metres.

Relevant Planning History

ADC/0512/08 - Revision to permission ADC/0337/08 to increase height of garage roof (retrospective). Granted 9.3.09

ADC/0337/08- Single-storey extensions to side and rear. Granted 3.9.08
ADC/0638/07 – side and rear extension. Refused. Appeal Dismissed.

SU/295/88 - Two-Storey Side Extension With First Floor Balcony At Rear. Refused 7.2.89

Consultations

Health: No objection.

Representations

3 objections to the original scheme received from residents of 28, 30 and 32 Beach Green summarised as follows:

1. Two storey side extensions have been rejected in the past. Nothing has changed.
2. The extension over the garage is unsightly, visually intrusive, unneighbourly and out of character.
3. Overdevelopment of site.
4. Damage to trees.
5. Loss of light from the west. Gap to single storey extension only 6 metres.
6. Drawings show side extension up to ridge height.
7. Drawings lacking in detail for the lay man
8. 5 metre high chimney does not account for the fact that houses are approximately 2 metres off ground level to avoid flooding. We will be affcetd by smoke pollution.
9. Where does the single storey extensions drain to, where's the guttering? It must not overhang the boundary.
10. How will the single storey extension be built? How will the wall be maintained abutting the fence?
11. The existing garage is much closer to the boundary with No.30 and 32 Beach Green than the plans indicate, about 5 inches only.
12. The Roof of the Garage - design, materials, appearance, loss of light, - the metal structure is in no way in keeping with the surrounding area. It will directly impact on light at certain times of day and impose upon our property at all times.
13. The large garage was built higher than it should have been.
14. The same objections apply to the single storey extension regarding its proximity to neighbours boundaries. But the chimney will cause smoke pollution in our homes and gardens and on the footpath at the rear.
15. The inaccuracies of the plans cannot result in a fair decision.
16. First floor extension overbearing and imposing.
17. The dark materials and protruding design add to the intruding and out of place feel of the extension.

Occupiers of No. 32 do not object to the revised proposal.

Further query received from No. 28 regarding the existing boundary wall and access required for maintenance purposes. Also how the extension is to be drained. Maintains an objection on loss of light grounds.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2019
Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and 15 including 'Development Management Standard No. 2 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development can be supported as it upgrades a dwelling within the built up area boundary. For consideration is the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area and the impacts of the development on neighbour amenity.

Neighbour amenity

The revised application proposes a single storey extension which would run alongside a large part of the rear garden boundary of 28 Beach Green. It has a mono pitched roof which is 2.15 metres high abutting the shared boundary and a maximum 3 metres in height off this boundary. The maximum 3 metre height is not reached until you are 2.7 metres inside the site garden.

A link extension from the existing rear addition is also proposed. This extension is 4.25 metres inside the boundary and has an eaves height of 3 metres and a maximum height of 3.9 metres to match the existing rear extension.

The site extends beyond the existing rear garden fence, northwards, by 1100mm and along this line are conifer trees. It is intended that the proposal extends to the full depth of the site. This will see the removal of some conifers. The extension will be visible from the raised river walkway too but this walkway is approximately 2 metres above the garden level and the extension will sit 4 or more metres from it.

The extension will be visible to neighbours, not least because their ground floors are raised above their rear garden level. The adjoining gardens are short but, at the scale and siting proposed, it is not considered that the extension, including the link, will cause significant loss of light to the house or garden of No. 28 or to any other neighbour.

It is worth noting that under permitted development regulations the applicant could build an outbuilding up to 2.5 metres in height on the shared boundary with No. 28.

Character

This is an unusual rear extension. It will not be visible from the road. It will be visible from the river walkway as it extends closer to it than the current rear boundary. Some conifers are also to be removed opening up a greater view from the walkway. The loss of trees is regrettable but they are not protected.

The extension will also be visible to neighbours but this is not untypical of domestic extensions.

A garden of approximately 90 sqm is retained.

It is not considered that it will harm local character.

Recommendation APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. *Approved Plans*
2. *3 years*
3. *No east or north facing windows*

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 any representations? Yes.

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 7/7/2020
Authorised and signed by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 7 July 2020