Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0204/13 Recommendation – Approve

Site: 7 Ravensbourne Close, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Front and side extensions to incorporate use of roof space as residential accommodation and pitched roof to existing flat roof side extension.

Date of site visit: 5th March 2013

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a detached bungalow in a cul de sac of similar properties. It has an existing front gable, detached single garage to the western side of the site and a driveway to the front. To the south of the site there is a wooded area. Work has currently commenced on site with the construction of a pitched roof above an existing side extension on the northern side of the bungalow. The pitched roof has a maximum height of 3.8 metres.

The front gable is to be increased in width and height to provide first floor accommodation. The gable is to increase by 2.7 metres to 7.9 metres in width and 1 metre in height to 5.4 metres. A side extension is also proposed on the southern side to continue the ridge by 3.5 metres. Roof lights are proposed to the front and rear elevation. The side extension will provide a lounge with vaulted ceiling. The front gable extension will be incorporated into a loft conversion to provide two bedrooms with a window in the front of the gable.

Representations: No third party representations have been received.

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' 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 bungalow is positioned in the corner of the cul de sac on lower ground level than the street. The bungalow is set back from the street by approximately 12 metres. The front gable extension will be visible in the street scene. It is however designed to be inkeeping with the existing gable with matching roof slope. The ridge of the gable will also be lower than the main ridge to allow it to appear subservient.

The pitched roof addition to the flat roof extension is set back and although it can be seen from the street it is subordinate and will not be a dominant feature within the street scene.

The side extension has been designed to continue the existing ridge to compliment the simple roof design of the bungalow. Due to the siting of the bungalow, set back from the street and 'tucked' into the corner of the site, this side elevation will not be clearly visible within the street scene. There is a boundary wall between the garage and the side elevation of the existing bungalow which encloses the rear garden. Access from the extension will be onto the rear garden via bi folding doors. Proposed materials are to match existing with painted white render, concrete tiles to match and stained timber boarding to the front gable extension.

Residential amenity

The main properties affected are those either side of the side, no. 6 to the north and no. 8 to the west. Due to the distance of approx 8 metres between the side elevation of no. 6 and the side of the application bungalow it is not considered that the proposed pitched roof addition to the existing extension will result in any loss of light or overbearing impact. There is also a single detached garage at no. 6 adjacent to the boundary which offers some screening to the rear garden. The gable extension is set well in from the boundary and although it will be higher and wider than existing it will not have any adverse impact in this case.

No. 8 to the west is at a minimum distance of 8 metres from the proposed side extension. The single garage at the application site also acts as a screen to the proposed extension. The eastern elevation of no. 8 is blank when viewed from the application site and therefore there are no windows or doors which will face onto the application site. Therefore there will be no adverse impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of this neighbouring bungalow.

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)

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. The extension hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: - Drawing no. 246/01 – received 18th March 2013
3. materials to match

Informatives

1. Precautionary land contamination

If during development, any visible contaminated or odorous material, (for example asbestos containing material, stained soil, petrol/diesel/solvent odour, underground tanks or associated pipework) not previously identified, is found to be present at the site, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until it has been investigated by the developer. The Local Planning Authority must be informed immediately of the nature and degree of the contamination present and a method statement detailing how the unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with must be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing before being implemented.

2. 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? N

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 9th April 2013

Authorised by: PD Date: 10.4.13