Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – Approve**

Site: **68 Slonk Hill Road, Shoreham-By-Sea**
West Sussex, BN43 6HY

Proposal: **Householder application for permitted development for prior approval for a single storey rear extension 3.5m in depth to be added onto the existing extension which is 3m deep, a total of 6.5m from rear wall of the original house, maximum height 3.94m and maximum eaves height of 2.54m.**

Date of site visit: 26 March 2014

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a detached bungalow on the north side of Slonk Hill Road. The land rises to the north and the rear of the property is below the level of the garden which rises to the rear. It is proposed to construct, as amended, a 3.5m deep extension at the rear. It is to be added onto an existing 3m deep extension and will therefore total 6.5m deep. The application was submitted for prior approval and, following an objection from an adjoining owner, the application now falls to be considered by the local planning authority to assess whether the effect on the amenity of adjoining properties is acceptable.

The bungalow has a deep footprint and the ground level rises to the rear. The proposed extension would be cut into the garden to continue the existing floor and ridge level. It will measure 3.94m high, with an eaves height of 2.54m.

Relevant site history

SU/100/86/TP – Single storey rear extension

Consultations

None

Representations

Original Plans – Letter of objection received from the occupier of 70 Slonk Hill Road on grounds of loss of privacy, light and overshadowing. Loss of property value. Inadequate parking, increased noise and disturbance.

Amended Plan - Letter of objection received from the occupier of 70 Slonk Hill Road on grounds of increased noise.

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’
Assessment of Saved Policies (ADC 2013)
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
Planning Practice Guidance (CLG 2014)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading of the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issue in this case is the effect on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Residential amenity

The neighbour to the west, No.70, has a conservatory extension at the rear which projects beyond the existing rear wall of No.68 and which has windows which face the side of No.68. Along the boundary with No.70, within the garden of No.68, there are tall conifer trees and other vegetation which cast a shadow over the side of No.70 and overshadow their raised patio. The proposed extension will necessitate the removal of these trees which will increase light to No.70. Even with the depth of the proposed extension taken into account, the proposal is not considered to result in harm to the occupiers of No.70 due to the relative ground levels, the low eaves and roof pitched away from the boundary.

A window previously proposed in the west side elevation has been omitted and it is not considered that noise disturbance will be any more significant than that experienced in the average dwelling. The room layout is not something which the local planning authority can control.

The neighbour to the east is not affected by the proposal, being shielded from the extension by garages between the properties.

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 3 year time limit
2. Materials to match existing dwelling
3. No side windows to west side
4. Approved plans

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

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.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 10 April 2014

Authorised by: Pete Devonport Date: 11.4.14