Expiry Date -

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/0091/14

Site: **25 Riverside**

Proposal: **Ground floor extension**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a single storey side extension with chimney to measure (at max) 4.7 metres in height, 5.5 metres in length, and 4.2m in width (6.5 metres in width at roof level, changing the hip to a gable end on the extension).

The application property is an L-shaped bungalow occupying a prominent corner plot to a highway junction. There is a considerable variation in building types in and around the application site of differing architectural styles.

The site is situated in an outer residential suburb of Shoreham, close to the beach and the new pedestrian bridge.

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/0841/12
Demolition of existing bungalow and garage and erection of 2 no. link attached contemporary style houses with 2 parking spaces
Refused 05/07/2013
Appeal Dismissed

AWDM/0520/11
Demolition of existing bungalow and garage and erection of 2 detached three-bedroom contemporary-style dwellings with 2 parking spaces at side
Refused 10.01.2012
Appeal Dismissed

Consultations

None

Representations

Email of support received from occupier of No. 24 Riverside – no further details given.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

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’
Assessment of Saved Policies (ADC 2013)
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle

Visual amenity

The extension would not disrupt the building line as it does not come too close to the highway, leaving sufficient spacing to avoid it appearing cramped.

Being single-storey with matching ridge and eaves, the scale of the extension is appropriate to the rest of the building.

Its exterior materials and finishes would match. Its fenestration would be of a similar design, and the introduction of a chimney is welcome.

No visual harm would arise from it.

Residential amenity

The extension is single storey in height and is positioned well off from any shared boundary to an adjoining neighbour. This would ensure the degree of overbearing and overshadowing resultant from it would not be unduly severe in its impact upon the living conditions of that neighbour.

The south boundary is demarked by close boarded fencing, so views from the proposed window in the rear of the new extension would be largely screened. Invasive overlooking onto neighbours would therefore not result, and unacceptable loss of privacy avoided.

Flood Risk

The site falls within Flood Zone 3, the highest category of flood risk.

Environment Agency standing advice in relation to domestic extensions has been complied with (use of endorsed resilience building methods is proposed), so no human health would be put at greater risk.

Any approval can be conditioned to secure this.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

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

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans and EA standing advice
3. Exterior materials 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: 27-2-2014

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 3 March 2014