~~PE~~ 23/10/08
Expiry
18/11/08

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0466/08 **Recommendation – Permit Application**

Site: **94 Slonk Hill Road Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 6HY**

Proposal: **Single-storey ridge-roofed rear extension**

The Application

The site is located within the built up area of Shoreham, a detached bungalow within a street of similar properties. The level of the site raises from south to north, there is a sloping driveway to the front with steps leading to the front of the bungalow, the rear garden is terraced.

Permission is sought for a rear extension 4. 2 metres in depth across the width of the property, a pitched, gable roof is proposed to match the existing height and design of the roof.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: **-** No third party representations have been received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005) (saved policies): LOC1, DEV1
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: - Development Control Standard No. 3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies

Structure Plan policies seek to protect, and where possible, enhance the character and distinctiveness of an area, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general.

Residential Amenity

The main properties to be affected are those to the east and west, no. 92 and no. 96 Slonk Hill Road. No. 92 is set further to the rear than no 94 by 1.6 metres. There is a distance of 1.5 metres between the site and this adjacent bungalow, it is therefore considered that there will be no loss of light or overbearing impact in this case to the adjacent bedroom window and rear conservatory. There is a side en-suite window which faces to the east, this will be conditioned to be fitted with obscured glazing and to be permanently non-openable.

The bungalow to the west is in line with no. 94 and there is a tall leylandii hedge along part of the boundary, (at no. 96) which will screen the extension to some extent. Although the extension will result in some loss of light to the rear of no. 96, it is considered that this is not so significant to warrant a refusal in this case, even if the existing hedge where to be removed.

Visual Amenity

The extension is sited to the rear of the bungalow therefore it is not visible within the street scene. The extension is considered to be in keeping in design and scale with the existing bungalow.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :- 1PPi

1. C1Ci
2. C12Ei
3. C18C3 - east

Case Officer.....Parker.....Date..23/10/08

PB 24/10/08