**Development Management - Delegated Officer Report**

**Application Number:** **Recommendation – APPROVE**
**AWDM/0878/11**

**Site:** **21 The Meadway, Shoreham-by-Sea**

**Proposal:** **Demolish existing porch and construction of a front extension and new open porch.**

**Date of site visit:** 08.11.11

**Neighbours checked:** Y

**Proposal**

The application relates to a detached chalet style bungalow, located on the northern side of the road, within the built-up area of Shoreham Beach. Permission is sought for the replacement of a timber lean-to front porch with a similar scale extension of matching white-painted, rough cast render, with uPVC windows, and doors, and a projecting canopy porch on four posts.

To the east are a pair of semi-detached flint and stone small bungalows (No's 23 & 25), whereas to the west is a hipped roof bungalow with front dormer and projecting front detail (No.19). Opposite is a detached modern bungalow with ridge and side gables. The mixed character area is made up of different dwelling sizes and designs, however the application dwelling and the adjacent properties hold a relatively strong building line (No's 11 - 25).

**Consultations and Representations**

***Third Parties:*** No third party objections.

**Relevant Planning Policies**
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies):
AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ comprising:
Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
South East Plan: CC1, CC6, BE1.
PPS1 ‘Delivering Sustainable Development (ODPM 2005

**Planning Assessment**

***Policies***
Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings; they should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general; the proportion of garden area taken by the proposal should not be excessive having regard to the character of the area; and it should comply with the Council’s adopted standards.

***Visual amenity***
The proposed replacement extension would not have as much of the character of the existing porch which is a timber construction with rendered infill panels and a large amount of glass, including some stained glass, and also the centrally located main front door.

The proposals would not be particularly larger that the existing lean-to, however it would have a less lightweight appearance due to the lack of fenestration. The submission was amended to realign the open porch to the centre of the extension and to introduce a more authentic style front door, with two windows (rather than one) either side of the door. This has resulted in a more symmetrical emphasis than it did when first submitted with an east side entrance door and single window.

***Residential amenity***
It is not considered that the proposals would result in a loss of outlook or sunlight or an unacceptable loss of privacy as a result of the proposals.

**Recommendation**

APPROVE for the reason that:

The proposed front extension and open porch would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the policies of the Adur District local Plan (AG1, AH7) or policies of the South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1).

Subject to conditions:

1. Standard 3 year time limit.
2. External materials and windows to match existing.
3. To be carried out in accordance with
   Drawing : C704-4A Site Location. Date Received: 28.11.11.
   Drawing : C704-3A Block Plan. Date Received: 28.11.11.
   Drawing : C704-5 Roof Plan. Date Received: 28.11.11.
   Drawing : C704-2A Plans and Elevations. Date Received: 28.11.11.

**Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation?** No

Case Officer: Carlos Hone Date: 05.01.12

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 06.1.12