Expiry Date – 4/12

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1555/17 Recommendation – Approve

Site: **7 Rectory Close, Shoreham**

Proposal: **Single-storey hip roofed rear extension and detached garage.**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 9/11

Site and Surroundings

Detached interwar bungalow on the east side of Rectory Close in an established residential area of Shoreham. The bungalow has a fully pitched roof with a subordinate front projection under a barn ended roof. The property is built in brick with the front projection rendered and all under a clay tiled roof.

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

Proposal

Planning permission is sought to add a 4.795 metre deep rear extension to this bungalow. The extension is to have a fully hipped roof with matching eaves and ridge lines, 2.3 and 5.8 metres in height respectively. It is shown to be built in matching brick and clay tiles.

Also proposed is a detached garage running parallel with the angled north side boundary. It is 6.6 metres deep, 3.6 metres wide and 2.2 metres high to eaves and 3.8 metres high to pitch.

Relevant Planning History

None.

Consultations

None received.

Representations

None received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012
Saved Local Plan policies AG1, AH2, AH5 and AH7 and Appendix 11 including Supplementary Planning Guidance comprising 'Development Control Standard No. 3 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.
Submission Adur Local Plan Policies 1, 2 and 15

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 proposed rear extension will run parallel with the rear garden boundary of houses in Rectory Road but 2 metres off it. These houses have rear gardens of at least 11 metres in length. The extension, even at the height proposed, hipping away from these boundaries will not cause significant harm to the light or outlook of Rectory Road properties or result in any overbearing impact. Houses at the rear in Kingston Lane are further away.

No. 6 Rectory Close, to the north of the site sits at a 45 degree angle to the site and its rear outlook is orientated north east. It has a single storey extension at the side of its property and this room has front and rear aspect and no side windows. The proposed rear extension will sit the full depth beyond the rear wall of No. 6 but 10 metres from it. It will not be harmful.

The garage proposed is on the boundary with No. 6. It is positioned 16 metres back from the pavement edge and approximately 4.5 metres of its length will extend beyond the rear wall of No. 6. In the absence of side windows at No.6 and its orientation away from the boundary a garage of this scale will not cause harm. This part of No. 6's garden is the least sensitive part of their large rear garden. The neighbour at No. 6 allowed access to his rear garden and confirmed on site he had no objection to the plans.

Appearance

The proposed rear extension is designed in matching materials under a pitched roof to match the existing bungalow. The garage has a traditional pitched roof appearance. They are both in keeping with the bungalow and the streetscene.

Recommendation APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved Plans
2. 3 years
3. Materials to Match

4. Garage – incidental use only
5. No new windows – north side

Informative

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? No.

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 24/11/17
Authorised and signed by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 24 November 2017