Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/0532/13

Site: **8 Upton Avenue**

Proposal: **Re-submission of AWDM/0411/13 for a single storey extension with external steps**

Neighbours checked: Y
Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a single storey rear extension with external steps to measure (at max) 4.2 metres in height, 4 metres in length, and 7.6 metres in width.

The application property is a detached bungalow with a hipped tiled roof and rendered walls. There is a substantial fall in the level of the land, hence the necessity for external steps at the rear of the proposal extension.

The hip-to-gable rear roof extension and side dormer are to be built under permitted development. These are shown on the drawings for completeness sake only.

Relevant Planning History
AWDM/0411/13
Single storey rear extension (Hip to gable rear roof extension and side dormer to be built under permitted development)
Withdrawn 23.04.2013

Consultations
None

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
Adur Local Plan: AG1, AH7
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Visual amenity

The extension is basic in its design but is not visible from public vantage point. Its roof sits at eaves height so its scale is appropriate to the rest of the building. Its external surfaces and fenestration would match that of the main house. The steps are of a typical design.

No visual harm would arise from this development.

Residential amenity – effect on existing dwellings

The neighbours principally impacted upon are those to either side of the application site (the development is physically removed from remaining neighbours).

The proposed steps do not allow for standing so no adverse harm would arise from comings and goings.

No.6 – neighbour to west

Sufficient distance is retained between the proposed extension and this neighbouring building so as to avoid undue overbearing and overshadowing effect arising.

No windows are proposed in this flank, so overlooking onto this neighbour is limited to oblique views with invasive loss of privacy avoided.

No. 10 – neighbour to east

It is recognised there is a fall in the gradient of the land running north-south. However the extension is single storey and flat roof in its design. There will be some 1.5 metres retained between the extension flank and the neighbouring building.

Under this circumstance there would be loss of light and outlook to the habitable room window of No. 10 Upton Avenue nearest to the shared boundary with No. 8. However these impacts would be marginal and not so adverse as to warrant refusal. It is noted that No. 10 is at a higher level than No. 8 which helps reduce these impacts.

The presence of the side window is regrettable. However it is to be obscured and top hung so intrusive overlooking and loss of privacy onto this neighbour would be negated.

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 or the policies of the NPPF

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time
2. Approved plans
3. Exterior materials to match
4. notwithstanding “pd” no windows in flanks
5. Window in east elevation be obscured and fixed shut to 1.7 metres from FFL

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 any representations? Y

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 24-06-2013

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 24 June 2013