Expiry Date -

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/1521/12

Site: **7 Edburton Gardens, Shoreham-by-Sea**

Proposal: **Extension to garage and porch**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for an extension to the existing garage to measure 2.4 metres in height, 2.7 metres in length, and 1.93 metres in width, plus a new porch attached to the west side of the extended garage measuring 1.8m wide, 3.3m deep and 2.4m high. The garage will project 6.1m in front of the main front elevation of the house (compared with 3.4m at present).

The application property is a detached two-storey 1970s dwellinghouse positioned at the far end corner of a cul-de-sac.

The site is situated in a residential estate in an outer suburb of Shoreham.

Relevant Planning History
None

Consultations
Adur & Worthing Councils: The **Environmental Health Officer** *requests precautionary contaminated land condition*

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

South East Plan (GOSE 2009): BE1, CC1, CC6
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’

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle

Visual amenity

The extension would straddle a good proportion of the frontage of the building and project significantly forward of it, breaking the building line. This extent of footprint would be unacceptable if the building was centrally positioned amongst the row of similar properties.

However, the building is nestled in the far corner of the cul-de-sac and the extension will be partly screened from the street by an existing hedge at the entrance to the site. As such the prominence of the extension is far diminished. Its obtrusiveness is further reduced by its integrated architectural design that successfully responds to the horizontal emphasis of the building. Some effort has been made to add visual interest to the exposed west elevation as well.

For these reasons, the visual harm resulting from the development would not be so adverse to warrant refusal.

Residential amenity – effect on existing dwellings

It is the neighbour to the east who is principally affected by the development (it is physically removed from the remainder).

The extension would run some length along the shared boundary with this neighbour. However it is single storey and flat roof in its design with substantial distance retained between it and the neighbouring building to the east. This ensures no adverse overbearing impact and overshadowing effect would result.

With no windows/openings proposed in its eastern flank, no intrusive overlooking and loss of privacy would result.

Parking

There would remain ample space to park on site to accommodate the needs of future occupiers without requiring to park on the street. The extension will provide a larger garage capable of accommodating one vehicle comfortably.

Contaminated Land

The site is not contaminated so informative would suffice to raise the applicant's awareness of this risk.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:

The proposed development can take place without detriment to the local environment and would not detract from the character or appearance of the area. It would not result in any detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and consequently does not

conflict with saved Adur District Local Plan policies AG1, AH7 and the South East Plan policies BE1, CC1, CC6

Subject to Conditions:

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Exterior materials to match
4. Notwithstanding “pd” no windows/openings in east elevation

Informative

If during development, any visible 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 no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) 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 shall be dealt with must be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing before being implemented

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 any representations? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 8-1-2013

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 8 February 2013