# Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: AWDM/1206/17 Recommendation – APPROVE**

**Site: 3 Elm Close, Shoreham-By-Sea**

**Proposal: Replacement front entrance porch to east elevation.**

**Date of site visit:** 26.09.17

**Neighbours checked: Y**

**Additional neighbour notifications: N**

## Site, Surroundings and Proposal

The application relates to a large detached dwelling within a cul de sac of similar dwellings. There is an existing conservatory style porch addition to the front elevation. Consent is sought to remove this structure and add a new front entrance porch, of brick and tile construction with a lean to roof with velux roof light. The porch remains of modest scale at 2.4 metres wide and 2 metres in depth. The maximum height with the sloping roof is 3.4 metres.

## Consultations:

West Sussex County Council Archaeology consultation
Comment

The area in the vicinity of Mill Hill has produced important archaeological evidence in the past comprising Roman settlement and a Saxon cemetery. However, there are no known archaeological remains in the immediate vicinity of the application address and none reported at the time of the construction of the houses to the south of the A27 Shoreham by-pass.

I consider that these modest proposals can be treated as *de minimis* and I do not consider that any archaeological investigation is necessary.

Recommendation

No archaeological action necessary.

**Representations:** None received.

## Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
Adur Submission Local Plan Policy 17 (2016)
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

## Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extension which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

***Visual Amenity***

The proposed porch will be visible within the street scene. It is to the front of the property. It is modest and subservient in scale, it will not over dominate the front elevation. Although it is higher than the existing uPVC porch, it is more in keeping and aesthetically pleasing with materials to match existing.

***Residential Amenity***

Due to the front garage projection the porch is screened fully from the dwellings to the south. Opposite the property faces onto an open green space and to the north is the integral garage of the adjacent dwelling. The porch is also set in from the boundary. It is not considered that this minor addition will give rise to any loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact to any adjacent residents.

***Other Matters***

Although not in the application description the submitted plans show some other minor alterations to the dwelling and many internal changes are proposed. The proposed side kitchen window is the only change that is likely to have any potential impact being a high level window to be replaced by a larger, standard window above the kitchen sink. This will face onto the side of the rear garden of no. 16 Downsway. Despite being shown on the submitted plans these works are considered to be permitted development and planning consent would not be required to make such a change. The only matter for consideration here is the proposed front porch replacement.

**Recommendation**

**APPROVE**

1. Standard time limit
2. Materials to match existing
3. Approved plans

***Informative***

1. Proactive with no amendments

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 26.09.17

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 26 September 2017