Application Number: **Recommendation –** APPROVE
AWDM/0609/14

Site: 418 Upper Shoreham Road

Proposal: Single-storey extension to front (south) elevation

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a single-storey front extension (to measure) some 3.3 metres in height, 6.6metres in length, and 1.3 metres in width.

The site is a detached two-storey building used as a nursery, with the frontage put over to parking.

The surrounding area is an outer residential suburb of Shoreham.

Relevant site history
ADC/0182/09
Change of use of guesthouse/dwellinghouse to children's day nursery with one-bedroom flat on second floor; single-storey east side infill extension and alterations to form twin accesses
25-06-09

Consultations (summarised)
West Sussex County Council Highways:
The proposal is situated in a sustainable location as the site is within walking distance of public car parks and has close links with the public transport network. The proposal would also not be anticipated to generate an increase in vehicle movements with respect to the existing use at the property, and the peak usage times would not be expected to coincide with peak traffic levels in this area.

Representations (summarised)
Objection from occupier of No. 395 Upper Shoreham Road:-
Extensively overdeveloped over the years. Residential area and worry site will become more developed and cause further issues for parking and safety

Relevant Planning Policies
Adur District Local Plan (saved policies): AG1, ACS1, ACS5
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of nursery accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Visual amenity

The extension would be of an appropriate scale to the rest of the building and would be built in matching exterior materials and finishes. Its fenestration would be of the same style and design as that on the main building. Insufficient visual harm would arise from it.

Residential amenity

The extension would be built close up to the shared boundary with the immediate neighbour to the west (it is this neighbour who is principally impacted upon this development as it is removed from the remainder).

The neighbouring building to the west exhibits no windows/openings in its flank facing onto the application site, and the extension is single storey; so adverse overbearing and overshadowing would not occur, and unacceptable overlooking would be negated.

The relocation of the bike store would not materially harm the amenities of the neighbour to the east as it is where neighbours are already subject to comings and goings (the bikes would be situated alongside the existing bins/recycling area).

Cycle and parking provision

The extension does not impact upon parking or vehicular turning space on site. The cycle storage would be relocated on the site, of an equivalent quantity and provision. It is debatable how effective the cycle store has been given the short periods of time most parents are on site dropping off/picking up; they are unlikely to need to store their bikes, so the nursery would operate equally without harm to highway safety if the cycle store were not provided. It is therefore not necessary to condition its relocation.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved Plans
3. Exterior materials to match

Informative:
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 letter(s) of representation? Y

Case Officer: Matthew Porter Date: 14-07-2014

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 16 July 2014