Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0388/24 Recommendation: APPROVE

Site: 7 Norman Crescent, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Proposed rear extension to garage to form gym and covered outdoor area.

Date of Site Visit: 23rd April 2024

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional neighbour notification: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a detached, substantial dwelling within a cul de sac of other two storey dwellings and adjacent bungalow. Many have similar appearance and design to the application site. A characterful, traditional style property with a front gabled projection, ground floor bays with hipped tiled roofs and a hipped roof porch centrally positioned. There is also a detached garage, set back to the side of the property. Due to the layout of the highway the front and east side of the building are visible within the street scene.

Consent was granted for a two storey rear extension and at the time of the site visit demolition work had taken place to commence these works, AWDM/0453/23. The current application seeks consent for an extension to the rear of the existing garage to form a gym and a covered area to the rear of this. The plans show the garage to be increased in length to double the existing depth with a continuation of the hipped roof to match. A store will remain at the front of the garage with the door and front elevation unchanged. Inside the building to the rear a gym is proposed and then the roof will continue but the rear section will be open as a covered area with two posts to the rear.

Amended plans have been received as the existing side boundary fence was shown to be at an angle and the building would be crossing this forming a straight boundary line. The revised plans show a new fence adjacent to the building along the boundary adjoining the neighbouring property.

Representations: - 1 representation received from the owner/occupier of 2 Buckingham Mews and 1 Woodview objecting to the development.

- The proposed outdoor kitchen extends past the property's boundaries.

- I have a lean to wooden shed fixed to the side of the house this has been there for 22 years.
- The proposed outdoor kitchen exceeds the boundaries of the deeds which is clearly outlined in the site plan, the proposed plan will clash with the existing lean to that is fixed to the side of my house.
- The development will block natural light to the area impacting my front and rear garden light.
- The noise from outdoor area will impact peace and quiet of all neighbours.
- The loss of garage will impact on cars parking in the street.
- Use of gym as a business will mean more traffic.

Consultations: - West Sussex County Council Highway Authority: - A single-bay garage will be lost as part of the proposed works. Therefore, vehicular parking would have to be accommodated on-street. The LHA would not anticipate that the proposed nil car parking provision would give rise to a highway safety concern or parking capacity issue in this location. However, the LPA are advised to consider the potential impacts on on-street parking from an amenity point of view.

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 115), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

Planning Assessment

Principle

The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Visual amenity

Due to the layout of the highway and the position of the proposed extension adjacent to the side boundary the development will be clearly visible within the street scene. The scale of the development combined with the design which continues the existing roof form at single storey level will not be overly large, prominent or overbearing

within the street scene and within the context of the existing dwelling. The new boundary fence will be erected along the boundary. It is noted that the fence currently ‘kinks’ in and there is a log store on the external side of the fence which according to the representations serves the neighbouring property. However the plans submitted show that the boundary is straight along this edge and the fence will adjoin the neighbouring building. Neither the fence or wall of the new extension will project further to the east than the front wall of the neighbouring dwelling to the north. This is shown on the plans and has been verified by the applicant’s agent and the applicant when discussed on site during the site visit.

Residential amenity

To the north of the site on the boundary is the blank side elevation of the neighbouring property. An objection has been received referring to the boundary fence and a log store that has been in situ for a long period of time, and which appears to have been sited on land within the applicant’s ownership. This is shown in the site photos. The plans show the boundary in a straight line in line with the side of the garage. It is not considered that this issue with regards to the log store and the boundary location are planning matters. It is not considered that the building or structure will have any adverse impact upon this adjacent dwelling. There will be no loss of light, overbearing impact or loss of privacy in this case. Any activity as a result of the outdoor kitchen would be similar to that which could be enjoyed within a garden area. The gym has been conditioned to be ancillary to the main dwelling for the enjoyment of the household only. Therefore as an extension to the living space at the dwelling. No harm would occur as a result which would warrant a refusal in this case.

Another objection has been received from the neighbouring property on the other side of the access to the side of the site. This again as a blank side elevation onto the side of the site, the impact would not be such to warrant a refusal in this case.

Highways and Parking

The proposal does include the loss of the single garage which will be changed to a store therefore a loss of a single parking space. However it is unlikely that this space was used for parking and there is a driveway and on street parking available. There is also a condition to limit the gym to ancillary use only so no additional traffic generation would occur. There is therefore no grounds to refuse the application in terms of parking or highway safety matters.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials to match existing
4. Gym ancillary.
5. No openings on eastern side of building.
6. The gym or outside kitchen shall not be used until the boundary fence has been installed.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation Y

1. Proactive with amendments

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 29th April 2024

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 29 April 2024