Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/2055/21 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 38 Riverside Road, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Proposed single storey front and rear extensions, cladding to front elevation and render to rear

Date of site visit: 7th December 2021

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a semi detached bungalow on the south side of Riverside Road on Shoreham Beach. As existing the bungalow is an L shape with a similar footprint as the attached bungalow forming a U shape together. There is an existing flat roof front porch in the corner and a conservatory to the rear. The front elevation is clad with white weatherboarding and the rear is white render.

Consent is sought to remove the rear conservatory and construct a single storey rear flat roof extension with the same footprint. Also proposed is a front flat roof extension adjacent to the existing front porch extending the same depth and infilling the space adjacent to the neighbouring property. The front will be clad in white weatherboarding and the rear will be white render, both to match existing.

Representations

None received

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 (July 2021)
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

The front extension will be clearly visible within the street scene. As existing the small front porch in the corner of the front elevation is of flat roof design and does not match the existing porch at the adjacent property. There is also variation in terms of the use of materials on both of these properties. Similarly neighbouring properties which originally followed this pattern of development have also been altered with materials and extensions differing in appearance and scale. It is therefore considered that the larger front extension can be permitted in terms of character, appearance and street scene impact. It complements the variation which currently exists. It will be finished in cladding to match existing.

The rear extension is to provide the same footprint as the existing conservatory. A solid extension with flat roof and white render to match existing is proposed. This is modest in scale and both extensions are considered to be subservient to the main dwelling and will have no adverse impact on the visual amenity of the existing building or locality.

Residential amenity

The main property to be affected by the front extension is the attached bungalow. The extension will increase the size of the front bedroom and will be adjacent to the boundary with the neighbouring property. The adjacent window is likely to be a bedroom to match the application site. The depth of extension is 2.7 metres. It is considered, on balance, that the proposed extension adjacent to the boundary at this limited depth will not result in any unneighbourly impact in terms of significant loss of light or overbearing impact to the adjacent window and can therefore be supported.

The rear extension is solid to the east elevation as proposed and was previously glazed. This will offer more privacy to the adjacent dwelling to the east. The extension is limited to 2.5 metres in depth and there is spacing between the site and the rear of the neighbouring property. There will be no adverse impact with regards to loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact.

The extension is set away from the boundary with the attached bungalow and there is a blank side elevation of a rear extension adjacent to the site. There are doors facing toward the boundary however this relationship is considered acceptable.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials to match existing white cladding to the front and white render to the rear.
4. No openings on the east elevation of the rear extension of west elevation of the front extension.

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

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 13th December 2021

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 14 December 2021