Expiry Date – 20/3

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1719/14 Recommendation – Approve

Site: 7 Cromleigh Way Southwick

Proposal: **Retention of single storey rear extension with wood burning flue 4.8m high.**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a chalet bungalow on the north west side of Cromleigh Way close to the junction with Overhill. The property sits on rising ground with the rear garden steeply rising up to the rear boundary and the rear lawn terraced above the ground level.

The property is not in a conservation area, is not a listed building and there are no protected trees on the site.

Planning permission is sought to retain a single storey rear extension with wood burning stove and consequent flue. This application follows an earlier larger extensions householder application last year for which no prior approval was necessary. Having built the extension with the flue, not permitted under the larger householder route, the applicant is seeking to regularise the situation.

Permission is only required because of the addition of the flue at construction stage.

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/1094/14 - Householder application for permitted development for prior approval for single storey rear extension measuring 3.6m from rear wall of the original dwelling, maximum height 3.4m and maximum height of eaves 2.6m. Prior Approval Not Required - 11.9.14

Consultations

Environmental Health: No objection.

Representations

None received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012
Core Strategy policy 16
Saved Local Plan policies RES7, H16 and H18
Supplementary Planning Guidance – Extending and Altering Your Home

Planning Assessment

Principle

Where proposals to extend family homes will not cause significant harm to neighbour amenity or the character and appearance of the property or wider area planning permission will generally be forthcoming.

Neighbour amenity

We have twice consulted neighbours on this proposal, once before it was constructed under the larger householder application consultation and again post construction and installation of the flue with this planning application. We have not received any complaints.

The extension measures 3.5 metres in depth, is 2.6 metres high to eaves and 3.4 metres high to ridge. A wood burning flue extends out of the new roof by 1.63 metres.

The extension is well removed from the boundary with No. 9 and causes the occupiers of this property no harm. It is on the boundary with No. 5. No. 5 is unextended but appears to a have a small lean to structure on the boundary tucked under the eaves of the house.

No. 5 is to the south west of the extension and the sunlight received to No. 5 is not affected by this proposal. Daylight will be little affected given the scale of the extension and it is also not considered to be overbearing. In the absence of neighbour objection no significant harm can be identified.

Neither houses at 5 or 7 have windows in their rear rooflsopes. The flue extends out of the extension roof close to the boundary with No. 5. It has been installed and passed by a competent person under the Building Regulations. Environmental Health have raised no objection to the proposal. There appears to be no reason why this domestic wood burning stove flue would cause any significant harm to a neighbour.

Design

The extension is not excessive and has the same eaves height as the original bungalow. It is acceptable.

Recommendation

Approve subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved Plans
2. No flank windows adj No. 5

Informatives

1. 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.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: MOK Date: 27.2.15

Authorised and signed by: PD Date: 27.2.15