Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1893/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 43 Hammy Lane, Shoreham-by-Sea, BN43 6GF

Proposal: Single Storey Front Extension.

Date of site visit: 11.01.2017

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a detached bungalow sited on a corner plot, facing Hammy Lane to the east and siding onto Hammy Way to the north. The bungalow has a gabled forward section, to the south of the front door. It is constructed of yellow brick, brown pantiles, and has PVCu windows and doors. There is a drive on the south side of the property.

The street scene is residential in character, and comprises a mixture of dwelling types and sizes. The neighbouring property to the south is semi-detached and has a flat roof dormer across both of the dwellings. Opposite is a two storey terrace. Further along the road to the north is Southlands Hospital.

Proposal

Permission is sought for a single storey gable extension with a pitched roof, to the east of the bungalow, of a similar design to the gabled forward section to the south. The extension, which will include a porch extension, will measure some 6.3m wide at the front x 3.8m long down the side of the bungalow. The ridge height of the roof will be approx. 4.2m. The extension will provide a new bedroom and en-suite bathroom.

A Supporting Statement has been submitted explaining that the new accommodation is required to meet the specific daily needs of the occupier on medical grounds.

Consultations: None

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
Submission Adur Local Plan 2016: Policy 15
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.

Whilst not the determining factor the need for the proposed extension is a material consideration.

Visual Amenity

Owing to its size and position on the front elevation, the proposed extension will be a prominent addition to the existing modest bungalow. However, it will not extend forward of the existing front gable feature. The design is in keeping with the style of existing dwelling with the pitched and ridged roof no taller than the existing roof. As originally submitted, the off-set fenestration within the front of the proposed gable appeared rather awkward. Whilst still not ideal, the front elevation has been improved by an amendment introducing a window to the bathroom. The new entrance door will be brought forward by some 1.8m to provide a lobby, apparently to aid heat retention of the property. On balance it is considered the extension will not appear so assertive or visually discordant in the street-scene to justify refusal in this case.

The proposed extension would be to the front elevation of the existing bungalow, and although a corner site, the bungalow is relatively well screened from the street by reason of the existing landscaping on the boundary. A tree on the boundary is shown to be removed on the plans, and the site visit revealed that the tree has undergone maintenance work last year, by the cutting back of its branches. This tree, although at the front, is sited virtually on top of the existing boundary wall, and long term would likely impinge on the boundary wall. Another tree, a variegated Holly, will have to be removed also, as it is sited so close to the existing front wall of the bungalow. It too will likely long term interfere with the existing bungalow, and in any case, it does not appear to be worthy of retention.

Residential Amenity

The neighbours that could be affected by the proposal is the one to the south, namely no. 41, no. 45 to the north and no.'s 46 and 48 to the east.

No. 41 is unlikely to view the extension as it will be behind the existing front forward section; no. 45 is located across the road approx. 23m distant, and thereby will not readily view the proposal; and no.'s 46 and 48 are some 30m distant.

Thereby, the proposed extension would not result in a loss of residential amenity

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to the following conditions

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

Informative

1. Approved following amendment

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

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 18.01.2017

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 26.01.2017