expires 26.09.08.

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0387/08 **Recommendation - Approve**

Site: **40 Cheal Close Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5RQ**

Proposal: **Rear extension and west side extension (to rear of garage)**

The Application

The application property is the eastern side of a pair of semi-detached bungalows located on the north side of Cheal close within the built up area of Shoreham.

The proposal is for two separate single-storey extensions, one located to the rear of the link attached garage which would be, 4.5m in width, by 4.0m in depth ~~width~~, by 2.3m in height. It would be used as an extended lounge. The other extension is a single storey extension to the rear which would be 6.9m in width, by 4.0m in depth, by 2.7m in height, and would be used as a master bedroom suite with bathroom and dressing room.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: There have been no third party objections to the proposals.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005) (saved policies): LOC1, DEV1
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.'
PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies
Structure Plan policies seek to protect, and where possible, enhance the character and distinctiveness of an area, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general.

Visual amenity
The proposed extensions would not be visible from the front of the bungalow to the South, and they would only be partially visible from public areas of Riverside Road 31m to the north. Whilst the form of the extensions are not considered to be particularly sympathetic to that of the existing bungalow, it is felt that as they have very limited effect on the streetscene that they would be acceptable in terms of design.

The rear gardens of the bungalows in Cheal Close are all relatively short, the application property being no exception at a length of 8.5 – 9.5m. Whilst the proposed rear extension would reduce the length of the garden to approximately 5.0m the amount of garden area retained would be 105 square metres, over the minimum standard as set out in the above Dev. Control Standard (100sqm). It is therefore considered that the size of the proposals would not result in the bungalow appearing out of character or over developed for the surrounding area.

Residential amenity
The proposals have been amended and now show the north side windows to the master bedroom and east side windows to the walk-in wardrobe and en-suite being obscurely glazed. It is felt that there would now not be a loss of privacy to the properties located to the north in Riverside Road and adjacent bungalow to the east (No. 38).

There was originally concern that the lack of a boundary fence between the two attached properties would have resulted in excessive overlooking from the west side doors serving the proposed bedroom. The applicant's agent has stated that a boundary fence 1.8m in height will be erected prior to occupation of the extensions, and it is felt that this would prevent any excessive overlooking and would retain the privacy of No.42. It is felt that any permission should be subject to a condition requiring the instatement of a fence prior to commencement of the development.

The Development Control Standard states that rooms should not be left in a deep recess and that extensions within 1.0m of the common boundary with an attached property should not be more than 3.5m in length. The relationship between the application site and attached neighbour are such that it would not be a habitable room left in the recess, only the rear obscurely glazed window and door serving the garage.

The attached bungalow has an east facing window serving a bedroom which looks directly towards the boundary. Currently part made up by the remnants of the existing boundary fence and a garden shed on the side of No. 42. It is considered that if a new fence is to replace the old in between the extension and boundary that the outlook would not be so badly affected to warrant a refusal.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-
1PPi

1. C1Ci
2. C14Ai – 25.09.08. (AH7 of the ADLP and DEV1 of the WSSP)
3. C12Eii
4. C18Ci – ...windows in the north and ~~south~~ east side elevations of the rear bedroom extension
5. C18Eii - ...north or west walls of the extensions....
6. C7Ci Policy AH7

Case Officer: [illegible]
Date: 25.9.08

PB 26/9/08