Expiry Date – 31/12

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1844/20 Recommendation – Grant

Site: 29 Saxons, Shoreham

Proposal: **Single-storey rear (north) extension and first floor side (east) extension; garage to be part converted to habitable accommodation with false pitch roof to front (south).**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 10/12 plus applicant's photos

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a detached house on the north side of Saxons on the bend of the road. The site adjoins an area of open land between No. 29 and No. 30. This land is not council owned but is maintained by the Council, for now.

This is one of four gable fronted houses on this side of the road, further south they are semi detached. No. 30, which is at right angles to the site and faces east/west is also a detached house but with a hipped roof. The street has a mixed vernacular.

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

Proposal

Planning permission is sought to infill between the rear of the garage and the kitchen and to convert part of the garage into a study. A first floor extension which extends the full depth of the original side wall is proposed with a hipped roof to create two additional bedrooms. The rear conservatory is to be replaced with a full width rear addition 2.91 metres in depth and flat roofed with rooflights.

Relevant Planning History

SU/79/80 – Extension to east and north elevations to form a utility. Granted 6.5.80

Consultations

Estates: This land is not owned by the Council.

Parks: Adur Parks used to maintain it and so the Council has continued to maintain it since we started working jointly some years ago (2010). We recognise that the Council does not own the land.

Highways: '*This application is for the partial conversion of garage to habitable accommodation and erection of single storey rear and first floor side extension to the property. The site is located on Saxons, an un-classified road subject to a speed limit of 30mph.*
No alterations to the existing vehicular access arrangements are proposed. The proposed extensions will not result in additional bedrooms on the site and therefore the proposal is not anticipated to result in an intensification of use of the access, nor is it anticipated to generate additional parking demand over existing.
The partial conversion of the garage will however result in the loss of one existing parking space for the dwelling. The WSCC Parking demand calculator expects that a minimum of 3 parking spaces will be required for the dwelling. As such, the proposal may result in an overspill parking demand, which could be accommodated on street. Whilst the LHA would not raise any highway safety concerns with regard to on-street parking in this location, the LPA may wish to consider the potential impacts of this development on on-street parking from an amenity point of view.
The partially retained garage will provide cycle storage for the proposal, encouraging sustainable transport methods.
Conclusion
The LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 109), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.'

Representations

The neighbour at 30 objects for the following reasons:

1. The side extension will be out of keeping with other 4 bedroom properties in Saxons.
2. The first floor extension is out of proportion to the rest of the property.
3. The en-suite could be changed to a 5th bedroom adding further to parking pressures in the street.
4. Is a front facing obscurely glazed en-suite window acceptable to the Council?
5. Parking in Saxons is difficult and driveways at 29 and 30 are often obstructed by on-street parking.
6. This development must not result in the obstruction of 30's driveway.
7. Has the applicant thought where the household's two cars will be parked when builder's vehicles/materials are on his driveway?
8. The location and block plans are inaccurate. No. 29 abuts the boundary with the open and, there is no east side passage within 29's land.
9. Does the applicant have permission to purchase a strip of this land?
10. The access to the open land is narrower than shown on the block plan.
11. Drawing 10 shows a proposed door from the new utility room opening out onto the AMENITY LAND to the east of 29 Saxons. I am aware that this amenity land is controlled by a RESTRICTIVE COVENANT maintained by Adur Council and should not therefore have immediate access from 29 Saxons.
12. Also will Adur Council allow a considerable amount of access and construction material onto the AMENITY LAND whilst development takes place?

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'.
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

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 first floor side extension adjoins open land. No side windows are proposed in it. It does intrude in front of No. 30. The flat roofed rear extension is less deep than the maximum depth of the existing conservatory. The infill between the garage and kitchen to form a utility will not be visible from neighbouring houses.

No neighbour harm will occur.

Character

The proposed first floor extension is not set back from the front but does have a lower roof form. It is acceptable as this is a detached house and at the end of the street abutting open land and therefore greater subordination is not required.

It will create a 4 bedroom dwelling and will look different to the other four identical houses in a row in this part of Saxons. However, the street itself otherwise has a more mixed character and this is not a sensitive area, i.e. conservation area.

It is not considered that the first floor extension will cause significant harm to local character.

The site abuts the open land on the east side. Where a door is proposed in the east side wall there is already a gate and so it appears direct access has been available for many years. The land is not council owned but is mown, for now, by the Council. It is publicly accessible. The new owner of the application site is not aware who owns the land.

The door is not critical to the development so could be replaced with a window in the future if required but as there is an existing gate it is not considered that the situation will be greatly changed.

Planning laws cannot control on street parking. This is a private matter between neighbours. There is no reason to believe that No. 30's driveway will be obstructed as a consequence of this development. There is space on the forecourt to store builder's materials once the applicant has parked elsewhere. The applicant is aware of No. 30's concerns.

Post development the Highway Authority is satisfied that the loss of the garage for car parking purposes is not significant. It is shown to be partly retained for cycle parking etc.

Recommendation APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. *Approved plans*
2. *3 years*
3. *Materials to Match*
4. *No new 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: 22.12.2020

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 22 December 2020