Expiry Date - 10/09/2014

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0941/14 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 152 Downside Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 6HD

Proposal: Single-storey extension to rear (north) and side (west) elevations.

Date of site visit: 29.7.14

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is a detached bungalow with a small west side addition up to the boundary. The surrounding area is mainly residential with a park to the south of the road.

The proposal is for a single storey rear extension 4 metres deep from the rear elevation, 4.8m wide and a maximum of 4.7m high under a gable ended pitched roof. There would be rear (n) facing French doors and a single door, an east facing casement window and two roof velux.

Also proposed is the rebuilding of the side addition.

Relevant site history None

Consultations None

Representations None

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur District Local Plan saved policies: AG1, AH7
SPG Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings
National Planning Policy Framework

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Visual amenity

The scale of the extension would be appropriate to its host dwelling and the matching exterior materials and roof angles and east side window that would align with the existing flank elevation window, would blend acceptably with the host dwelling. The side addition would be very small relative to the house and being the same design and scale as the current such addition and of matching materials, it would not appear disharmonious.

The street scene would be unaltered given the similarity of the side addition with the existing and the relatively concealed position of the rear extension.

Residential amenity - neighbours

The neighbours principally impacted upon by this development are those to either side at 154 (w) and 150 (e).

No. 154 has a rear conservatory roughly the same depth as the proposed rear extension. Whilst the extension would be 4m deep and therefore 500mm deeper than that recommended within the SPG, the added depth is minimal and by virtue of the 4m gap between the proposed extension and this conservatory, the new build would not breach a 45 degree angle from its rear north facing windows. Also regard is had to the proposed roof pitch angle which would ease the impact upon the side of the neighbouring dwelling's extension. Therefore, given the scale and position of the proposed extension it would cause no significant loss of light or any impression of undue dominance for the purposes of the dwelling at no. 154. The absence of proposed west side windows would prevent loss of privacy. The roof velux would be well above eye height.

The side extension would be as at present and therefore no material difference in effect would result for the purposes of no. 154.

The rear extension would be 6m from the property to the east at no. 150. Given this distance of separation and the presence of tall fencing at the common boundary between the respective dwellings, the proposed side window would not cause any serious loss of privacy to this neighbouring home. The roof velux would be well above eye height. Again the scale of the addition would not be so great as to result in any serious loss of light or impression of dominance.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans: location plan, block plan and drawing no. 14/04-01 received 16/7/14.
3. Exterior materials/finishes to match.
4. No w side windows or other openings

Expiry Date - 10/09/2014

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 letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: L Simmons Date: 14-8-2014

Authorised by: J Morin Date: 18.08.2014