Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0901/15 Recommendation – Approve

Site: 44 Kingston Close

Proposal: Single storey rear and side extension and hip-to-gable roof extension with rear dormer (Amended re-submission of AWDM/0408/15).

Date of site visit:

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is a semi-detached bungalow in small cul-de-sac in an outer residential suburb of Shoreham.

The proposal is for a single storey rear/side extension and a hip-to-gable roof extension with rear dormer. The full details of this development are detailed out in the submitted drawings.

Relevant site history
AWDM/0408/15
Single storey rear extension; raised roof ridge with front and rear dormers
Withdrawn 15-05-2015

Consultations (summarised)
Adur & Worthing Councils Environmental Health: *No adverse comments*

Adur & Worthing Councils Contamination Officer: *Full condition (potentially contaminated)*

Southern Water: *Requires a formal application for any new connection to public foul/surface water sewer to be made by applicant/developer.*

Representations (summarised)
Objections received from occupiers of 43 and 46 Kingston Close:-
Will be completely overlooked in my garden. Will block out natural light to side window. Close to my kitchen window.

Relevant Planning Policies
Adur District Local Plan saved policies: AG1, AH7
National Planning Policy Framework

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Visual amenity

The rear extension is of a domestic scale. Its flat roof would sit above the eaves, but this feature would not be conspicuously visible from public viewpoint.

The rear dormer would be large but is set in from the outer edge of the extended roof. It is somewhat bulky and cumbersome, but so are many of the neighbouring bungalows – the proposed dormer would be comparable to these, and not out of keeping for this reason.

Residential amenity

It is neighbours to either side and to the east who are principally impacted upon by this development.

Neighbour to east

There is a garage at the side of this neighbouring property which would obstruct the majority of views from the rear bedroom dormer onto the immediate neighbour in this direction. Intrusive views into their private rooms would not arise and the rear garden would be only obliquely overlooked. The rear bathroom window can be obscured and top hung for added privacy.

Neighbour to north

This physically adjoining building has itself been extended at the rear, set off from the shared boundary. A habitable room window exists between this and the shared boundary, and the room it serves may experience a narrowing of light and outlook as a result of the proposal.

However the extension length is only some 3 metres closest to the boundary, with its length beyond this tapered away. As such resultant overbearing and overshadowing impact from this would be comparable to a scenario under “permitted development” (work done without the need for express planning permission) – so the severity of harm would not justify refusal, especially as the extension is flat roofed.

The dormer is large but set above the eaves so would not adversely overbear or overshadow. Direct views into neighbour’s habitable rooms would be avoided with overlooking oblique, so potential for unacceptable loss of privacy is negated.

Neighbour to south

This neighbouring building has itself been extended by way of a rear extension. The majority of length of the proposed extension would be set off from the shared boundary with suitable distance retained to avoid adverse overbearing and overshadowing - the section proposed to abut the boundary would correspond to the blank wall of the neighbour’s own extension.

The dormer is large but set above the eaves so would not adversely overbear or overshadow. Direct views into neighbour's habitable rooms would be avoided with overlooking oblique, so potential for unacceptable loss of privacy is negated.

Contamination

The site falls within land identified as potentially contaminated. This consists of an infilled gravel pit which was identified on a map in 1912.

Notwithstanding this fact, the entire residential neighbourhood and supporting sewers and road network, which included the host dwelling, was built out and completed in 1937; at this point in time contamination of the land would have been revealed.

Additionally, the applicant has dug a foundation trench in anticipation of receiving planning approval. No contamination was revealed during this ground evacuation.

In such circumstance, to impose a full methodology contamination report would be disproportionate to the risk and costly for the applicant. Instead, the imposing of a precautionary contamination condition would be a more appropriate means to ensure the Council is notified of any discovery of contamination during the extension build out.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Exterior materials/finishes to match
4. Dormer bathroom window be obscured glazed and top hung
5. If, during development, any visibly contaminated or odorous material (for example asbestos-containing material, stained soil, petrol/diesel/solvent odour, underground tanks or associated pipework) not previously identified is found to be present at the site, then, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, no further development shall be carried out until it has been investigated by the developer. The Local Planning Authority must be informed immediately of the nature and degree of the contamination present and a method statement detailing how the unsuspected contamination is proposed to be dealt with shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall then be implemented as approved within an approved time period contained in the method statement.

   Reason: To prevent pollution of groundwater and in the interests of environmental protection and public health and safety, in compliance with Saved Worthing Local Plan policy RES7.

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 letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: Matthew Porter Date: 22-7-2015

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 22 July 2015