Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – Permit**
AWDM/0665/11

Site: **33 Williams Road, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex BN43 6BP**

Proposal: **Part two, part single storey side extension and front porch canopy.**

Date of site visit: 20.09.11

Neighbours checked: Y

Proposal
The application relates to an end-of-terrace house located at the northern end of this run of four 1940's houses, located on the west side of the road. The dwelling is painted render and occupies a plot that is 11m wide at the front and 8.5m wide at the rear. The plot is 32m deep and the dwelling is sited in the middle with approximately equal sized front and rear gardens.

Permission is sought for a north side extension in the gap between the existing dwelling and the boundary with the adjacent house (No. 35). The extension would mainly be a two-storey element which follows the profile of the existing house. It would be 2.7m wide, by 6.8m deep (the entire depth of the house), by 8.2m in height with a part hipped roof. To the north and west (rear) of the two storey element would be a single storey projection that would enable the proposed ground floor rooms to be larger than those as first floor. The single-storey element would be set back by 0.6m and would have a mono-pitched roof that would run into a ridged roof at the rear where the extension projects to the rear of the building. It would extend beyond the rear by 2m in depth and would be 4.2m in width. The proposals would provide a lounge at ground floor and an additional bedroom and bathroom at first floor.

To the north of the site is No.35, the southern half of a pair of semi-detached houses. It is sited further forward in its plot, closer to the road, so that the rear elevation is approximately in line with the front of the application house. A 1.8m high fence separates the two dwellings, and the applicant currently has a shed located in the space between the boundary and the house.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: There have been no third party objections to the proposals.

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'
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies
Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings; they should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general; the proportion of garden area taken by the proposal should not be excessive having regard to the character of the area; and it should comply with the Council's adopted standards.

Visual amenity
The proposed extension would project to the side of the existing house by 2.7m, and would follow the front and rear elevations. Whilst ordinarily the above DC Standard expects that two-storey extension should be subservient to the main dwelling to prevent it from over dominating the original house, and to prevent any problems with matching materials, it is considered that in this case, the extension would continue the appearance of the terrace as a whole and would not appear too dominant. The two-storey element would be a similar width to the north of the front door as is currently to the south, and is considered to be a sympathetic size. A 1.3m gap to the main boundary, and the neighbour to the north being off-set, would ensure that the space between the dwellings would remain, to a certain degree.

The proposed single-storey element would be slightly set back from the two-storey section and would have a relatively low roof line that would not be particularly visible, apart from the most direct of views. The proposed fenestration in the extension would match the casement windows in the original dwelling and others within the rest of the terrace. They would be a contrast to the bow window replacement to the south of the front door, however as this is more modern addition it is not considered that it should be replicated in the design.

The proposed materials will be conditioned to match to ensure the extensions do not have an incongruous appearance.

Residential amenity
The proposed extension will be closer to the boundary at the rear (west) as a result of the irregular shaped plot. The NW corner of the single storey element would be 0.2m from the boundary wall. The two-storey element would however be located 1.4m from the boundary at its closest point.

The adjacent dwelling is served by a side patio 3 – 4m in width accessed by a door from the kitchen in the south elevation. It is enclosed by the boundary fence and a high gate to the east, and the rear garden extends to the west. The dwelling is served by ground floor windows to the kitchen and living room in the rear.

Whilst the extension would be relatively close to the boundary at the rear, towards the front where it is evident that the side patio of No.35 is used, it would be set further away due to the angular shaped plots. The 'bulk' of the 2-

storey extension would have some enclosing effect on the outlook from the side and rear of No.35, and the patio, but owing to the forward position of No.35 in relation to the application property it is considered the effect would not be unacceptably poor. The flank wall of the single-storey part of the extension would project beyond the existing rear building line and above the boundary fence by 0.5m, and although the pitched-roof would have more visual prominence it would slope away from the neighbours dwelling to such a degree that it would not have an unacceptable impact and would not appear unduly over bearing. Similarly, the additional bulk of the extension in proximity to the boundary would increase the extent overshadowing but would not be significantly worse than the current situation to warrant refusal on this ground.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason that:

The proposed extension would have some additional effect on the outlook from the side and rear of No.35, however it is considered that resulting impact would not be unacceptable on the residential amenities of this property. The extension would not detract from the local built 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).

Subject to:

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. No windows or openings in the north side of the extension.
3. Materials to match.
4. Title: 1:1250 Site Location and 1:500 Block Plan. Date Received: 31.10.11
   Drawing No: AS.574.2A. Date Received: 31.10.11

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

Case Officer: Carlos Hone Date: 30.11.11

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 1.12.11