**Expiry Date -**

# Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number:** **Recommendation – APPROVE**
**AWDM/0675/12**

**Site:** **10 Springate Road, Southwick**

**Proposal:** **Single storey rear extension with raised rooflight and two front dormers (rear dormer and side gable constructed under permitted development)**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: /N

**Proposal, Site and Surroundings**

The proposal is for a single storey rear extension to measure (at max) 3.5 metres in height, 4 metres in length, and 9.2 metres in width, and 2no. front dormers each to measure (at max) 0.9 metres in height, 1.1 metres in length, and 0.9 metres in width

The application property is an inter-war semi-detached bungalow with part render part brick walls. The surrounding area is residential in its character.

**Relevant Planning History**
None

**Consultations**
***Worthing & Adur Councils:*** The **Environmental Health** officer requests precautionary contamination condition

**Representations**
None

**Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance**

South East Plan (GOSE 2009): BE1, CC1, CC6
Saved Adur Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7

**Planning Assessment**

***Principle***

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle

***Visual amenity***

The design of the rear extension is rudimentary but is not visible from public vantage point and is of a suitable scale to the main house. It would have matching materials to the main house.

Although front dormers are largely absent from the wider street scene, there are dormers to No. 11, which is immediately opposite No. 10.

The current proposal is for two dormers similar to those of No. 11, but without the hipped roofs. Because the new dormers closely resemble those at No. 11, and are well proportioned and sympathetically positioned on the roof slope of the main house, they would be not be incongruous with the character and appearance of the street.

The front dormers would unbalance the symmetry of the bungalows, but it would already be disrupted from the hip-to-gable roof extension.

***Residential amenity – effect on existing dwellings***

It is the attached neighbour who would be most affected by this development (it is physically removed from remaining neighbours).

The rear extension would bring built form closer to the shared boundary with this neighbour reducing that occupier's light and outlook.

However the extension is flat roof in its design. It would also have a length of 3. 5 metres. This meets the Council's adopted development control standard, which sets out the maximum limit to acceptable development. No windows are proposed in its flank onto the boundary.

In this circumstance, the impact upon the neighbour would not be unduly adverse in terms of overbearing and/or overshadowing effect with invasive direct overlooking negated.

***Contaminated Land***
The site is not contaminated so an informative would suffice to raise the applicant's awareness of this risk

**Recommendation**

**APPROVE** for the reason:-

The proposed development can take place without detriment to the local environment and would not detract from the character or appearance of the area. It would not result in any detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and consequently does not conflict with saved Adur Local Plan policies AG1, AH7 and the South East Plan policies BE1, CC1, CC6

**Subject to Conditions:-**

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans

3. Materials and finishes to match
4. No windows/openings in extension flanks

**Informative**

*If during development, any visible contaminated or odorous material, (for example asbestos containing material, stained soil, petrol/diesel/solvent odour, underground tanks or associated pipework) not previously identified, is found to be present at the site, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until it has been investigated by the developer. The Local Planning Authority must be informed immediately of the nature and degree of the contamination present and a method statement detailing how the unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with must be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing before being implemented*

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 31-08-2012

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 5 September 2012