Expiry Date - 27/03/2015

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0106/15 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 2 Hammy Close Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 6BL

Proposal: Single-storey rear extension to replace existing conservatory

Date of site visit: 3/2/15

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a semi-detached bungalow on the north side of the road. The dwelling has a rear conservatory. The boundary on the west side with 1 Hammy Close is enclosed by a tall close boarded fence. The garage of the property lies to the rear on the east side. No. 3 also has a rear sited garage at the common boundary with no.2 but this is set further forward south towards the driveway and road access/crossover. There is otherwise a fence to this boundary at the rear / side.

The proposal is to remove the conservatory and replace it with a single-storey rear extension a maximum of 2.9m high, 6.7m wide, and between 2.35m and 4.5m deep infilling the current indented return of the footprint on the rear of the dwelling. There would be no side windows but roof lights and rear/north facing patio doors. Materials would match the existing house.

[The extension is shown encroaching the boundary and Notice has been served on the neighbour and Cert B submitted.]

Relevant site history

SU/415/79/TP/8948 - Erection of garage. Approved

Consultations None.

Representations None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7, AH9 and Appendix 11 ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’ National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Expiry Date - 27/03/2015

Planning Assessment

Principle

The upgrading of the housing stock is supported in principal.

Visual amenity

The extension would be mainly out of view from the front and would thereby not alter the street scene to any significant degree. The build would harmonise adequately with the host dwelling and would be of modest height. Overall it is considered an acceptable form of addition.

Residential amenity

By reason of the extension's single-storey form and absence of side windows it will not harm the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring property to either side at nos. 1 and 3, by way of any significant loss of privacy. There would be no significant increased interception of light or loss of outlook given the absence of any north-facing window of no. 3. There is a north facing window in the dwelling at no. 1. Whilst the maximum depth of the addition exceeds the 3.5m normally required as a limit as set out within supplementary planning guidance as above referenced, regard must be had to the permission for a comparable extension granted for No. 1 to the west (AWDM/1486/14 refers) that would obviate all neighbour impacts in terms of light or outlook.

Regard is had also to the current provisions for larger home extensions that allows additions up to 6m in depth in the absence of neighbour objections which latter situation applies in this instance.

The addition would be too distant from neighbouring property to the north and sufficiently obscured from their view as to lead to material harm to their occupiers' amenities.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Materials to match existing dwelling
3. No side apertures
4. Approved plans:

- 1425/1/B location and block plan
- 1425/10 existing and proposed ground floor plans
- 1425/11existing and proposed first floor showing extension flat roof
- 1425/12 existing and proposed north and south elevations

- 1425/13 existing and proposed west elevations and section A and
- 1425/14 existing and proposed east elevations and section B

received 30/1/15.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

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.

Case Officer: L Simmons Date: 3/3/15

Authorised by: J Morin Date: 23.03.2015