Expiry Date – 28/8

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1043/17 Recommendation – Grant

Site: 48 Riverside Road, Shoreham

Proposal: **Single storey side extension.**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 12/9

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a semi detached bungalow on the south side of Riverside Road in a row of bungalows. Built between the wars the bungalow has a one sided curved bay window and recessed porch. It has a gated car port up to the side boundary with rear garden access and a conservatory behind.

These properties sit slightly angled to the road and have a slightly staggered building line. No. 48 sits on higher ground than 46, to the west.

The property is not in a conservation area and is not listed. There are no protected trees on the site.

Proposal

A side extension is proposed with a matching front curved bay window and extended flat roof rear bay detail. The extension runs the full depth of the house, other than the bays and is set off the side boundary by between 700mm at at the front and 1200mm at the rear. It will have a subordinate hipped roof with matching eaves line and 4 metres high to ridge. The rear elevation has two gables side by side, beach style with the same proportions.

Relevant Planning History

SU/04/0081 – Single storey side extension. Granted 20.5.04

Consultations

Environmental Health: Precautionary contamination informative and PFA informative recommended.

Representations

None received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Submission Adur Local Plan Policy 15;
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

Principle

The proposal can be supported in principle as it upgrades a house within the built up area boundary. Of primary concern is the impact of the development on neighbour amenity and the streetscene.

Neighbour amenity

No 46 Riverside Road has a parapeted and flat roofed garage up to the shared side boundary with No. 48. This garage is closer to the road than the side extension now proposed. They have also recently erected a garden building on the shared boundary behind the rear wall of the house. The space between the back of the garage and the rear outbuilding is the least sensitive part of their garden and used for domestic storage purposes. Residents of No. 46 advised on site that they have no objection to the extension.

The side wall of the extension is set off the shared boundary. There are existing conservatory windows facing west which can be seen from No. 46. The effects of the new dining room window proposed in the side wall will be little different. The tall bedroom window proposed is between the back of the garage and the garden building but will be partly obscured by the boundary fence and does not overlook any neighbouring windows or private 'sitting area' within the neighbouring garden.

Extending the existing flat roofed rear bay window will have no impact on either neighbour.

No significant harm will occur to occupiers of 46. No other neighbour is directly affected.

Streetscene

Other bungalows in the street have extended to the side of their properties up to the side boundary. None have replicated the curved bay detail of the original house but it is considered that the proposed addition will be a sympathetic addition to the streetscene. It is no further forward than the existing bay and will sit comfortably behind the front wall of the garage at No. 46.

Recommendation APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved Plans
2. 3 years
3. 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.

2. Precautionary contamination

3. PFA

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 15/9/17
Authorised and signed by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 15 September 2017