Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – Approve**
AWDM/0877/12

Site: **4 Seahaven Gardens, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5NX**

Proposal: **Part two-storey/part single-storey side extension and single-storey rear extension**

Date of site visit: 19 July 2012

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is a detached dwelling located at the end of a cul-de-sac. It is separated from its neighbour to the south by its driveway leading to a garage within the rear garden. It is proposed to construct a part single/part two storey extension at the side, wrapping round with a single storey extension at the rear. The two storey element is centrally located on the side wall of the house and has a single storey lean-to element in front with a flat roofed section at the rear. It measures 2.3m wide and is to be built up to the boundary with No. 3 to the south. A lean-to extension, 3m in depth, is proposed to run across the full width of the rear of the house, extending to the southern boundary between the side extension and the garage. An existing conservatory is to be removed.

Also proposed is an enlarged front porch which will measure 2.2m wide, 1.3m deep and 3.4m high.

Relevant site history

None

Consultations

Adur District Council: The Environmental Health Officer recommends the precautionary contaminated land informative

Representations

None

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 (GOSE 2009): CC1, CC6, BE1
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading of 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 is a subsidiary addition to the house, having a lower ridge and being set back from the front wall. The two storey element has a hipped roof which helps to reduce its bulk and increase the separation with No.3. While it is to be built within 1m of the boundary, contrary to advice in DC Standard No.3, in this case it is considered to be acceptable as No.3 is unable to extend on its northern side, having just 1m available to the side boundary. Consequently, concerns over a future terracing effect are avoided. The property’s location in the cul-de-sac also reduces the prominence of the extension in the street scene.

The enlarged front porch is an acceptable increase. There are a variety of dwelling styles in the cul-de-sac and the proposal will not harm its character or appearance.

Residential amenity

There are no windows on the north side of No.3 and it will not be affected by the proposed side extension. The rear extension, at just 3.4m depth, will also not adversely affect the amenities at No.3. To the north, No. 5, is also not considered to be affected by this proposal. At 3m depth the extension would ordinarily be ‘permitted development’ but in this case it requires permission because of the ‘wraparound’ to the side.

Accessibility and parking

The proposal will result in the loss of the garage and driveway. However, there is space available at the front of the dwelling for 2 cars which is considered to be adequate.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development 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 saved

policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) or the policies of the South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1)

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Materials to match existing dwelling etc
3. Permission relates to approved plans

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, 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? N

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 20 December 2012

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 20 December 2012