Expiry Date -

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/1061/13

Site: **35 Kings Walk**

Proposal: **Front extension with balcony over**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: /N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a front extension with balcony to measure (at max) some 3.8 metres in height, 3.3 metres in length, and 8.1 metres in width.

The application property is a detached two-storey building with white rendered walls, facing onto Shoreham Beach.

The surrounding area in an outer residential suburb of Shoreham.

Relevant Planning History
None

Consultations
None

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adur Local Plan: AG1, AH7
National Planning Policy Framework

Planning Assessment

Principle

The upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle

Visual amenity

The scale of the extension would be suitably subservient to the main building. The exterior materials and finishes would match that of the main house, and the fenestration would be similar to that of the main house.

There is enough variation in the building line to sufficiently absorb the slight forward protrusion of front extension without it appearing out of character. Almost all the properties have balconies on them so this feature would not be incongruous.

For these reasons, no visual harm would arise from it.

Residential amenity

The neighbours principally impacted upon by the proposal are those immediately to either side (the development is physically removed from the remainder)

The extension is sufficiently removed from neighbouring buildings as to avoid undue overbearing and overshadowing.

There would be an increased propensity for overlooking from the balcony and extension but views obtained from both would be onto the public front gardens of neighbours, and only obliquely into neighbour's habitable rooms. Balconies are an established feature on building frontages facing the street, which already lacks privacy as all the properties face onto the public beach. Any loss of privacy would not be materially harmful therefore.

Recommendation
APPROVE for the reason:-

The development would not detract from the local environment and has taken place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the 'saved' policies of the Adur Local Plan (AG1, AH7) and the planning policies set out in the National Planning Policy Framework

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Exterior materials/finishes to match

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 any representations? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 24-9-2013

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 8 October 2013