Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – Approve**
AWDM/1304/15

Site: **42 Slonk Hill Road, Shoreham by Sea**

Proposal: **Front infill extension**

Date of site visit: 20 October 2015

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings
The application site comprises a detached bungalow located on the north side of Slonk Hill Road which is a predominantly residential street comprising of similar bungalows in the immediate vicinity. The bungalows on the north side of the street are sited in an elevated position and with a staggered building line. The bungalow has gables to front and rear and a flat roofed front projection. This form is repeated in neighbouring bungalows on the north side of the street with projecting front porches and front gables.

Permission is sought for a gabled front extension which would be approximately 1.8 metres in depth, infilling the corner between the existing front projection and the opposite side wall. The extension would follow the ridge line of the existing roof (finishing at 5.35 metres in height from the sloping ground level) and eaves level of the existing building and be finished in matching materials.

Relevant site history
AWDM/ 1305/15 Certificate of Lawfulness for a single storey extension to the rear. Pending consideration.

No.78 – permission for infill gabled extension approved 9/3/2011.
ADC/0020/11 refers

Consultations
None

Representations
None received

Planning Assessment
Visual amenity
The proposed form of the extension would be sympathetic to the design of the recipient building and the main gable would still be set back from the main gables of neighbouring properties to the west so as not to be dominant in the streetscene. Whilst the proposals would result in the loss of the flat-roofed porch, which is a common feature within the street, there are other examples elsewhere in the street where similar extensions have been carried out and it

would not result in any significant harm to the character of the building or streetscene subject to the use of matching materials.

Residential amenity
The proposed extension would project to the front of the building by approximately 1.8m, the same distance as the existing porch. Although there would be an increase in width and height due to the sloping roof, it is not considered that it would result in an overshadowing or overbearing effect on the two adjacent dwellings.

The proposal also involves blocking up the original front door and therefore the existing side door would become the new main entrance to the dwelling and so there may be an increase in activity at the side of the building closest to the neighbour at No.44. However as a residential dwelling, any increase in noise and disturbance are unlikely to pose any significant threat to neighbour amenity and having regard to permitted development fallback which would allow the front door to be blocked and that the occupier may choose to use the existing side door as the main entrance in any event, this aspect is considered acceptable. Alterations to the windows in the side elevation of the existing house could be carried out as permitted development.

Recommendation

Approve
Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit 3 years
2. Matching materials
3. No further side windows
4. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Drawing number ap/01/SlonkHillRd42 entitled 'Existing Plans and Elevations' deposited 3 September 2015
   Drawing number ap/02/SlonkHillRd42 entitled 'Proposed Front Extensions, Plans and Elevations' deposited 3 September 2015
   Drawing number ap/04/SlonkHillRd42 entitled 'Block Plan' deposited 3 September 2015
   Drawing number ap/04/SlonkHillRd42 entitled 'Location Plan' deposited 3 September 2015
   Drawing number ap/10/SLonkHillRd42 entitled 'Side elevation' deposited 26 October 2015

Informative:
1. 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: 27 October 2015

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 27 October 2015