Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0430/20 Recommendation – Approve

Site: 17 Benbow Close, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Demolition of existing shed to north-west. Construction of single-storey side extension to north elevation with false pitch roof to east.

Date of site visit: 20 May 2020

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is a semi-detached bungalow on a corner plot in Benbow Close. Its rear/side garden is open to views from the street. There is currently a flat roofed extension and a smaller timber shed running along the western boundary of the garden with No. 18.

It is proposed to remove the shed and construct a new extension measuring 3.75m long, 3.9m wide and 3m high. A false monopitched roof is proposed along the front (east) edge of the extension which will continue to run over the flat roof of the existing extension and link with the pitched roof of the original bungalow. The total length of the existing and proposed extensions will run the full depth of the garden (7.3m).

Relevant Planning History

None

Consultations

None

Representations

None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

The extension will be visible from the street but will have a more sympathetic appearance than existing. The false pitch roof will sit below the ridge height of the original bungalow. The length of the extension is deeper than would normally be allowed under DM Standard 2 but a material consideration is the presence of the existing shed in the same position which, although 0.5m lower than the roof of the proposed extension, does cover more or less the same footprint. The amount of additional garden area lost to the extension is not significant and the proposal will not therefore diminish the amount of amenity space for the occupier unduly, particularly as a car port has also been removed from the garden.

Residential amenity

The property most affected by the proposal is 18 Benbow Close. The existing and proposed extensions will be a total of 7.3m long and have the potential to affect light and outlook for those occupiers.

However, the existing extension and shed also covers a distance of about 7m in length and the proposal will see an increase in height of approximately 0.5m at a distance 3.2m from the rear of No.18. The new false pitch roof will be set off the boundary and should not diminish light.

A visit to the rear of No.18 was not possible but Google Maps shows that the property has a window close to the boundary at the rear which is likely to already be affected by the existing buildings, but which is likely to be further affected by this proposal. However, the difference between existing and proposed is not considered to be so significant as to cause a serious increase in loss of amenity.

It is also worth noting that the neighbour has contacted the applicant to state they do not object to the proposal.

On balance, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit

3. Materials to match existing

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

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.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 22 May 2020

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 22 May 2020