Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/0391/13** **Recommendation –** Approve

Site: 17 Herbert Road, Sompting

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and erection of single storey rear extension and raised patio.

Date of site visit: 29 April 2013

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The site relates to a detached bungalow located on the west side of Herbert Road. This is a predominantly residential area comprising mainly of semi detached bungalows, with No.17 being one of the few detached properties in the immediate vicinity. The ground level slopes steeply up from south to north with the bungalows stepped to accommodate the change in level.

Permission is sought for a rear extension to the southern half of the rear elevation to connect to the side wall of an existing 4.5 metre rear projection and extending a further 4 metres beyond that.

The extension would measure 8.51 metres in depth in total and 4.59 metres in width and would have a flat roof with false pitch measuring approximately 4.2 metres in height when measured from the southern end ground level. The extension is proposed to be finished in render with concrete plain roof tiles to match the existing house.

Relevant site history
None relevant

Consultations
Adur and Worthing Councils: The Environmental Health Officer has recommended a precautionary contamination condition.

Sompting Parish Council: *supports the application*

Representations
None received

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

Planning Assessment
The site is not identified as being potentially contaminated therefore an informative is considered sufficient to advise the applicant of potential contamination.

Residential amenity
To the north, the extension itself would be well separated from the No. 19 and the site sits at a slightly lower level than No.19. The raised patio area would be adjacent to the boundary with No.19 and although an intervening shed at No.19 provides some screening to the private garden, it is considered that screening would be necessary to prevent any significant overlooking. If approved, a condition would require screening of 1.7m height from the patio level. The applicant has provided amended plans showing the extent of screening.

The main impact of the extension itself would be to the occupiers of No. 15 to the south.

The proposed depth of the extension is considerable, and its impact potentially unneighbourly to the rear windows in the main rear wall of No.15 and to the garden area between the rear wall and the neighbours own timber garage structure, particularly given the lower ground level that the neighbouring property is sited at.

However the site orientation does limit the extent of the impact and there is a separation distance of approximately 2.6 metres between the side walls of the two bungalows. The permitted development fallback should also be considered where a 4 metre deep extension could be constructed as permitted development at a slightly reduced eaves and ridge height than that proposed. Although the proposals are for a much deeper extension, the part of the extension beyond the 4 metre depth would be set behind the line of the neighbours own garage structure and its impact at this point, although it would be visible above the height of the garage, would not be significant.

On balance, having regard to the permitted development fallback position and the specific relationship between the two properties where the intervening garage would be sited between the additional depth and the affected windows, the proposal is considered acceptable on residential amenity grounds subject to the side kitchen window being high level only in the interest of protecting privacy. The applicant has provided amended plans to revise the side kitchen window accordingly.

Visual amenity

Although the extension would be a large flat roofed structure, the inclusion of a false pitch and matching materials would help it to blend with the recipient building and given the presence of other large flat roofed structures in the vicinity and its positioning at the rear of the house, it would not be harmful to the visual amenities of the site or surrounding area.

Recommendation

Approve for the reason:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) or the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit 3 years
2. Matching materials
3. South side windows to be obscure glazed/fixed below 1.7m
4. No side windows without permission
5. Screening to north of patio to be installed
6. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Unnumbered site location plan deposited 1 May 2013
   Drawing No. 9937/1 Rev A entitled 'Existing & Proposed Floor Plans, Elevations & Section' deposited 20 June 2013
   Drawing No. 9937/2 entitled 'Block Plan' deposited 1 May 2013

Informative:

- Contamination precaution
- 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.

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

Case Officer: Rebekah Smith Date: 25 June 2013

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 25 June 2013