Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – Approve**
AWDM/0640/12

Site: **33 Kingston Close, Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 6LP**

Proposal: **Part rear, part side single-storey extension**

Date of site visit: 23.05.12

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings
The application relates to the southern half of a pair of semi-detached, hipped roof, 1950's bungalows, located at the end of a cul-de-sac on the southern side of the turning head. The site is an irregular shaped plot within the built up area, and the dwelling itself is one of multiple pairs of similar design built at the same period within the close.

Permission is sought for a single-storey flat-roofed part side, part rear extension to provide an additional bedroom to the bungalow, making it into a three-bedroom bungalow. The proposed bedroom extension would be attached to the side of an existing rear extension at the rear of the bungalow, and it would be 3.5m wide, by 3.9m deep, by 3m in height. It would be built in rendered block work on top of a 0.5m high brick plinth, with a flat roof to tie in with the existing rear extension.

To the east of the dwelling is No. 34 is located at an angle to the application property, owing to the angled siting with which it addresses the turning head. The separation between the two dwellings is 7.5m at the point at which the extension would begin. The extension itself would be, at its closest, 5m from the rear of No.34.

Representations

Third Parties: There have been no third party objections.

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'
South East Plan (GOSE 2009): CC1, CC6, BE1
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Visual amenity

The Council's DC Standard No.3 states that extensions which are clearly visible from the road would usually require a roof that is sympathetic to the host dwelling, in this case a hipped tiled roof. In this instance, although the extension is located to the side of the bungalow, it is well set back from the road, and screened from view from the east and west by the built form of the neighbouring properties, and from the front by a relatively mature garden and 1.8m high fence and gate arrangement. The only place that the extension would be visible would be from directly in front of the bungalow and from the adjacent garden of No.34. On the basis that the proposed extension is likely to have a very limited impact on the visual amenity of the surrounding area, it is not felt that the flat roof would warrant a refusal in this case.

Residential amenity

The proposed extension would be sited at an angle to that adjacent property at a distance which would be a minimum of 5m away. The extension would be set back further into the rear garden than the neighbour's rear extension, and would be partially screened by a 2m high boundary fence. Whilst the extension would be visible in oblique views from the conservatory at the rear of No.34, it is not considered that this would have an adverse impact on their outlook, sunlight or privacy to an extent that would be unacceptable.

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 South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1)

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Materials to match existing dwelling etc
3. No windows or other openings in east side wall of the extension etc
4. Permission relates to approved plans:

Drawing No: 12/02-01	Date Received: 21.05.12
Drawing No: 12/02-02	Date Received: 21.05.12
Drawing No: 12/02-03	Date Received: 21.05.12

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: C. Hone Date: 28.06.12

Authorised by: P Barnett Date: 29.06.12