Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/2143/20 **Recommendation – APPROVE**

Site: **42 Parkside, Shoreham-by-Sea, BN43 6HA**

Proposal: **Proposed flat roof rear extension with external steps (existing extensions removed).**

Date of site visit: Assessment has been assisted using the Applicants plan and photo; Earthlight mapping; and Google 3D of the site

Proposal, Site and Surroundings:

The property is a hipped roof, two storey dwelling with existing single storey rear extensions, with lower lying land to the rear.

Parkside rises from south to north, and the application site is sited on the east of the road, indeed most of the dwellings are sited on the east, with the west side generally occupied by garages.

Most of the dwellings in the street have rear extensions of some form and some have dormers and first floor extensions. The neighbouring property to the south, no. 40, has a hipped roof, two storey rear extension and a dormer extension; no. 44 to the north has a fully glazed conservatory extension across part of the rear elevation, to a depth of approximately 5.5m, with a further single storey rear extension across the remaining part of the rear elevation. The fully glazed conservatory is up to the mutual boundary with the application site, and has a series of windows directly overlooking the application site.

The proposal seeks permission to remove the existing rear single storey extensions, and replace with a brick and render single storey, flat roof extension. There are no windows on the side elevations, but the rear has triple full sized glazed doors and there is a roof lantern. As the land at the rear is lower than floor level, there will be a platform measuring some 5m in width x 1.3m in depth, outside of the glazed doors and steps leading down the approx. 900mm to the garden.

The proposed extension will be dog legged, and will measure approx. 5m in depth on the south side elevation, and two sections of wall on the north side elevation shown on the plans to be 2.49 next to the host dwelling, and 2.475 on the remaining section. The whole width will be approx. 5.7m and the height, taking on board the lower land, will be some 3.7m

Relevant Planning History: None

Consultations: None

Representations: 2 letters of objection from 44 Parkside

- The side wall of the extension is showing as 5m to be erected within 1m of our boundary which will block light into our conservatory;
- The view from our conservatory will be onto a brick wall;
- The applicant said it would be 'L' shaped so the wall would not be running in line with my conservatory windows;

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

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

Planning Assessment

Principle:

There is no objection in principle to the proposal to provide a rear extension. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities on the neighbouring properties and the character of the locality.

Visual & Residential amenities

The dwelling is a two storey semi-detached property with existing rear extensions, the one next to its adjoining neighbour to the north being a brick built conservatory with a brick elevation with no windows facing onto no. 44, and the southern one being a rendered finish utility room, also with no windows in its side elevation. The depth of these extensions are some 2m, and both have individual sets of steps leading down to the garden.

The replacement extension will also be of a brick and render construction with the north side wall facing no. 44 having no windows. The extension has been stepped away from the boundary with no. 44 for the first 2.49m by approx. 500mm, whereas currently the existing brick extension is stepped away from no. 44 by approx. 400mm. Therefore although the first section of new wall next to no. 44 will be approx. 500mm longer it will provide a slightly wider gap between the conservatory at no. 44 and the proposal.

The second section of wall next to no. 44 will be just under 2.5m in depth, and this section will be sited slightly over 1.1m in distance from the neighbouring conservatory. It will not be deeper in length than the conservatory at No.44 or the extension at No.40.

The neighbour at No.44 has objected to the proposal stating that, amongst other things, it will block their view. This is a moot point as there are certain factors that are in play here, firstly in planning there is no right to a view; also the neighbouring conservatory itself is constructed up to the boundary, with windows within the elevation directly facing onto no. 44, which itself is deemed an unneighbourly form of development, plus the fanlights open over the boundary and onto no. 42's land; the application shows the proposal to be 500mm away from the neighbours conservatory, in line with their existing extension, and then steps away to be some 1.1m from the conservatory; lastly, the

applicants would have every right to provide a 2m high boundary fence onto the mutual boundary without the need for planning permission. Ergo, the proposed extension and proximity to the neighbouring property is deemed to be acceptable in planning terms. Light will continue to reach the conservatory through its glazed roof and the angled corner of the conservatory which will continue to project beyond the proposed extension. If a conservatory was to be permitted today, it would be required to have obscured glazing or restricted openings on the boundary.

Further the Local Plan SPG regarding extensions and alterations to dwellings states that it would be acceptable for single storey rear extensions to be 1m from a mutual boundary.

The materials for the construction of the rear extension will match the existing dwelling, that is brick for the lower half and render for the upper half. The render will contribute to some light reflection towards the neighbour at no.44. This coupled with the approx. 1.1m separation distance for the rear half of the extension, it is considered that on balance the proposed rear extension is reasonable.

Lastly, a platform is proposed directly to the rear of the extension to allow persons to stand whilst opening and or closing the door, at approx. 1.2m deep, this is considered not to be excessive for such a use, particularly with regard to health and safety factors. It will be at a lower level than the neighbouring conservatory and overlooking is not considered to be harmful, particularly taking into account the existing situation where clear windows from the conservatory currently overlook the site.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard time limit
3. Materials
4. Windows

Informatives

1. Approved without amendment

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

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 25.02.2021

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 25 February 2021