Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/0203/13** **Recommendation –** Approve

Site: 54 Berriedale Drive, Sompting

Proposal: Single storey rear extension (existing conservatory removed)

Date of site visit: 14 March 2013

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The site relates to a semi detached bungalow located on the south side of Berriedale Drive. This is a predominantly residential area comprising of matching semi detached bungalows in the immediate vicinity.

Permission is sought for a flat roofed rear extension across the full width of the house measuring 4.72 metres in depth and 2.9 metres in height. Matching materials are proposed. The extension would replace an existing 3.6 metre deep extension at the rear.

Relevant site history
None relevant

Consultations
Adur and Worthing Councils: The Environmental Health Officer has recommended a precautionary contamination condition.

Sompting Parish Council: supports the application

Representations
None

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’
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment
The site is not identified as being potentially contaminated therefore an informative is considered sufficient to advise the applicant of potential contamination.

Residential amenity
To the east the extension would be well separated from the neighbouring bungalow at No.56 which is set across a shared driveway and has modest

lean to structures at the rear, and has been designed to taper with the line of the garden boundary. Subject to the use of obscure glazing to the side window there would be no significant impact to the amenities of the occupier to the east.

To the west, the adjoining bungalow at no. 52 has been extended to a similar depth as the existing rear addition at No.54, and with an additional flat roofed structure extending beyond that at its western end at the rear. The proposed extension would be approximately 2.9 metres in height at the boundary and 4.72 metres in depth which although this is relatively deep would be only 1.1metres deeper than the existing structure and similar to the relationship with the neighbours own extension. Given the existence of the neighbours extension it is considered that there would be no significant impact in terms of loss of light or outlook and the additional depth is not so large that it would give rise to any significant 'tunnelling' effects, having regard to the neighbours staggered rear elevation. Subject to a condition requiring no further windows being inserted without permission, privacy would be maintained.

Visual amenity

Although the extension would be a large flat roofed structure, the proposed extension would not be readily visible in the streetscene and given the presence of other similar structures in the immediate vicinity of the site it would not be harmful to the visual amenities of the site or surrounding area. The use of matching materials would help it to blend with the existing building.

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 time limit 3 years
2. Matching materials
3. Obscure glazing to side (east) window
4. No further side windows
5. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Drawing Number 82/863/01 deposited 1 March 2013
   Drawing Number 82/863/02 rev A deposited 1 March 2013

Informative:

- Contamination precaution
- 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: Rebekah Smith Date: 25 April 2013

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 29 April 2013