Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1086/21 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 97 Slonk Hill Road, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Proposed porch to front elevation. Single storey rear extension with raised balcony

Date of site visit: 6th July 2021

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a detached bungalow within a street of similar properties on the south side of Slonk Hill Road in Shoreham. There is a flat roof detached garage set back to the side of the building. Ground level drops to the rear and also the property to the west is at a slightly higher level. There is an existing raised terrace to the rear of the bungalow with steps down to the garden.

Consent is sought for a front porch and rear single storey gable extension with raised balcony and privacy screens. Amended plans have been received which show the front extension reduced from 2.5 metres in depth to 1.5 metres. The rear extension is 2.4 metres in depth with the rear raised balcony 1.4 metres in depth, 1.8 metre high privacy screens are proposed to the sides.

Representations

None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

As amended both the rear and front extensions are considered to be subservient to the main dwelling, they will be built in materials to match and are of gable roof design to complement the existing building style. The rear extension continues the roof projection in a simplistic form and the front porch is reduced in height from the main ridge to provide a modest front addition. There are other examples of small scale porches and some flat roof garages project forward, the general character of the street is uniform and this proposal as amended will be in keeping with this.

The rear extension will not be clearly visible in the street scene however it is not overly large and the rear raised balcony will be enclosed by glazed balustrade and privacy screening. This feature will have no adverse impact in terms of character and appearance of the locality.

Residential amenity

The main properties to be affected by the proposed development are those either side and to the rear. The front porch will be visible within the street scene however due to its limited size and distance from the boundaries it will have no adverse impact.

To the west is the neighbouring property with a garage set back spacing the properties. The neighbouring property has a rear conservatory with glazing to the side and rear. The extension will project to the side of this with the privacy screen serving the balcony also adjacent to this boundary. Due to the limited depth of 3.9 metres including the extension and balcony and the spacing between the properties this relationship is acceptable. There will be no significant loss of light or overbearing impact. The privacy screens to the balcony will remove any unneighbourly impact when occupying the outside raised space.

To the east similarly there is separation due to the garage at the application site. This has a solid side elevation, the proposed extension will therefore not impact upon this neighbouring side elevation.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials to match existing
4. No additional windows on the east or west elevation of the extensions.
5. No use of the balcony until the privacy screens are in place and shall remain at all times.

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

1. Proactive with amendments

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 20th July 2021

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 20 July 2021