Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/0087/13** **Recommendation –** Approve

Site: 9 Havenside, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Rear and side single storey extension linking with existing garage

Date of site visit: 4 March 2013

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The site relates to a semi detached house located on the north side of Havenside relatively close to the sea front which is to the south. This is a predominantly residential area comprising of a mix of bungalows and two storey houses of varied design.

Permission is sought for a rear extension across the full width of the house measuring 3.3 metres in depth from the rear wall and continuing into the recess (where there is an existing conservatory to be replaced) measuring 6.9 metres in depth on this side. The extension would wrap around to the side of the house and continue to form a porch canopy area over the existing side entrance door. The extension would also link to the existing garage, replacing the existing lean-to structure.

Relevant site history
SU/253/88/TP – planning permission granted for 2 semi detached chalet houses in 1988.
SU/19/92/TP – permission refused for additional window to kitchen on west side.
SU/94/97/TP - permission granted for conservatory at rear.

Consultations

Adur and Worthing Councils: The Environmental Health Officer has recommended a precautionary contamination condition.

Representations
None 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’
South East Plan (GOSE 2009): CC1, CC6, BE1
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

The site is not identified as being potentially contaminated therefore an informative is considered sufficient to advise the applicant of any potential contamination.

Residential amenity
To the east the adjoining house at No.9a has been extended with a flat roof infill in the recess and conservatory extending beyond that, both adjacent to the boundary. Although the proposed extension is deep on this side, measuring 6.9 metres, because of the size and position of the neighbouring extension and conservatory the impact of the extension on 9a would not be significant.

To the west, the neighbouring bungalow at No. 7 is set at a higher ground level, approximately 0.3m, and there is approximately 6 metre spacing between the side wall of this bungalow and that of the application site. The neighbouring bungalow has windows facing the application site but the main outlook for habitable rooms is to the front and rear. Given the existing relationship between these two properties and where outlook from the side of No.7 is towards the side wall of the existing two storey house, a single storey lean-to design as proposed would not pose any significant threat to residential amenity in terms of loss of light or outlook, having regard to its scale. Revised plans have been received including an existing side window which serves the landing to now be retained. A rooflight window is proposed to the west roofslope but this would be at a high level and would therefore not cause any significant loss of privacy.

Visual amenity
The extension has been designed as a reasonably subservient addition and, given its scale and positioning, it would not unbalance the appearance of this pair of semi-detached houses to an extent to warrant refusal of the application, particularly given the variety of housing design in the vicinity.

Although the extension would be a fairly large flat roofed structure at the rear, this part of the proposed extension would not be readily visible in the streetscene with the lean-to roof along the side extension part screening much of this from view and only partially visible towards the rear of the site.

It is considered that the proposed extensions would not harm the visual amenities of the site or surrounding area. The use of matching materials would help to blend the extensions with the existing building.

Flood risk
The site lies within Flood risk Zone 3 where the Environment Agencies standing advice would apply. The applicant has confirmed that floor levels within the proposed development will be set no lower than existing levels and flood proofing of the proposed development has been incorporated where appropriate.

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 consequently would 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 time limit 3 years
2. Matching materials
3. No further side windows without permission (east or west side)
4. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Drawing Number: 05 deposited 29 January 2013
   Drawing Number: 01 Revision A entitled 'Plans and Elevations as Existing' deposited 4 March 2013
   Drawing Number: 02 Revision A entitled 'Plans and Elevations as Proposed' deposited 4 March 2013
   Email of clarification dated 7 March 2013

Informatives:

- Contamination precaution
- 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: Rebekah Smith Date: 2 April 2013

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 2 April 2013