Expiry Date - 21/09/2012

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0879/12 **Recommendation – APPROVE**

Site: **27 Springate Road Southwick Brighton West Sussex**

Proposal: **Demolition of existing garage, conservatory and extension and erection of single storey rear extension and two storey side and rear extension (second storey in roof)**

Site visit 19.7.12

Site and surrounds

The application property is a semi detached inter war bungalow in a pleasant residential suburban street in Southwick, typified by similar bungalows with strong period and vernacular features including hipped plain tiled roofs, bow bays, gablets above doors and use of render and brick.

The property stands on a tight bend where, unusually, a short vehicular service access projects off to the south of the apex of the bend to form a short, narrow stub. Facing this are two pairs of semi detached bungalows with shallow front gardens (Nos 19-25) .

Opposite the property is a similar corner pair of bungalows. The corner most (No 13) is currently building out a substantial side extension f8illing in the open corner of the side/front garden. This was won on appeal (AWDM/0825/11).

The paired semi detached bungalow to the application property at No 29 has been extended at the side including hipped roof (SW/2/01/TP/18932). At the rear, a hipped roof conservatory has been built around 2 metres in depth and 2.5 metres tall, set off the common boundary by around 500mms. The area around this is used as a patio. The common boundary with No 28 is formed by 1.5 metres tall close braded fence, supplemented by a small tree. An original flat roof outrigger and flank window also faces the application site garden.

The application property includes an original outrigger on its far side facing No 29 which has been extended by a small monopitched extension on the east side. A 1.5 metres deep 2 metres tall conservatory sits inside the outrigger, some 0.5 metres off the boundary with No 29 and is adjoined by a decked seating area.

On the east side of the application property is a side garage with flat roof. The front garden is hare landscaped except the corner with the access way stub where two large shrubs grow.

The boundary with the stub access way to the east is formed by a 2 metres tall brick wall with surmounted close boarded fence and above shrubs.

The property backs onto the rear gardens of the dwellings in Manor Hall Road.

Proposal

This has been amended following negotiations to reduce the scale of the rear extension's visual and amenity impact.

The scheme involves demolishing the existing garage, conservatory and monopitched building. A side extension some 2.4 metres wide would be built, set in between 1 and 2 metres from the east side and access way stub. This has a hipped roof to match the existing with front window similar to the extended neighbour at No 29. The extension runs to the back beyond the existing conservatory to a gross depth of 13.5 metres. It dog legs in so that the depth adjacent to No 29 is 4 metres from the original rear wall, 1.5 metres beyond the existing conservatory but is set in hard up to the boundary at this point. The bulk of the roof is hipped and includes two rooflights in the west elevation ; on in the east (in the original roof) and one in the south (rear) . The doglegged extension is flat roofed and 2.9 metres tall. The extensions are faced in render and brick –plinth to match the existing and plain tiles on the hipped roof, likewise.

The ground floor extension serves anew dressing room and bathrooms at the front and enlarged kitchen and sitting room at the rear whilst the upper floor in the roof serves two bedrooms and a shower/bathroom /WC.

Relevant Planning History

None

Consultations

The Executive Head of Health and Community Safety recommends precautionary land contamination informative.

Representations

None

Planning Policy Framework

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

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

Principle

The proposal enlarges and upgrades a modest, with marginal loss of garden (greenfield land) in the urban area in a sustainable location.

Visual amenity

The side extension balances the symmetry of the paired semis following the extension built at no 29 in a generally sympathetic and appropriate manner. It largely infills the plot close to the adjacent access stub but leaves sufficient space at the front through the retained set back to avoid uncomfortably crowding the plot. The acceptability of infilling such plots has already been established under AWDM/0825/11 – see appendix 1. However the front window would balance its neighbour more effectively if it were a double rather than single unit and this may be achieved by condition.

The extension is deep and very visible from the stub adjacent access way but there is sufficient separation from the neighbours at no 19-25 and the revised roof form gels well with the character of the bungalow.

The design is generally sympathetic to the architectural style of the bungalow.

Impact on neighbouring amenity and living conditions

The side extension achieves an acceptable relationship with no 19-25 due to its hipped design and separation distance. The one rooflight facing these serves a bathroom and is obscure glazed. The ground floor windows and door are screened by the boundary fence

The flat roofed dog leg extension is deeper and taller than the existing conservatory adjacent to No 29 but not significantly so. The west elevation is solid which avoids problems by minimising noise and light pollution. The right to insert windows here may be removed by condition. Adequate light and outlook for the neighbour would remain given the southern aspect of the neighbour conservatory and patio.

The rooflights in the west elevation are high up and avoid overlooking and this can be secured by condition. The ground floor windows of the main extension facing No 29 are some 5 metres from the common boundary and invasive views are largely screened by the boundary treatment at this point but a finalised solution may be customized to suit both neighbours, given the Permitted Development rights available for fences.

Views to the rear from the rooflights are limited by the high siting in the roof and separation distances. Such windows may be inserted independently under Permitted Development rights in any event.

Adequate garden space is retained.

An informative on land contamination is justified as a precaution.

Access and parking

The loss of the garage is acceptable as adequate forecourt parking remains and there appears to be some capacity on street to absorb any unmet demand.

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 or parking. 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) or The National Planning Policy Framework

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Materials to match existing dwelling etc
3. No windows or other openings in the west elevation of the extension
4. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Drawing No: 525/01-A deposited 15.10.12
5. Front window to side extension (north elevation) to be a double unit to match the existing extension to No 29.
6. Sills of the rooflight in the west elevation of the roof as extended shall be no less than 1.7 metres above finished floor levels.

Informative on land contamination

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: P. Devonport Date: 18.10.12

Authorised and signed by: Gary Peck Date: 19 October 2012

4. The Council's objections relate to the side extension with its rearward projection. It suggests that there would be an imbalance in the proportions of the semi-detached pair with their respective central doorways flanked by bay windows. However, a significant imbalance has already been created in this pair by a prominent front dormer window at the adjoining bungalow. I appreciate that the original form of the pair is repeated throughout Springate Road. Nonetheless, the corner position of the appeal property in a short section of the road is such that an end addition would cause much less interruption of building rhythm than would be the case with the insertion of an extension within a longer row of such dwellings.

5. Whilst the corner position brings greater prominence, design elements of the proposal such as the precise matching of roof form and window detailing would provide pleasing respect for the scale and style of the present bungalow. To my mind, this has more significance than elevational symmetry. Subject to matching material finishes, I am satisfied that overall visual harmony with the existing structure would be achieved. By such means, the scheme would meet the design principles for extensions as set out in the Council's supplementary planning guidance under Development Control Standard No. 3. 6. Although the SPG states that side extensions should usually be set back slightly from the front wall of the existing dwelling to create a visual break and subordination, I see no compelling reason why this is necessary in this instance where the end of row position already provides a clear demarcation in the street's building alignment.

7. In terms of its impact on the surroundings, it is clearly the case that the extension would be seen from the north as projecting beyond the line of building frontages running towards the appeal site. However, in such views, the bungalow at No. 27 opposite the site already forms a visual stop at the turn of the road and the profile of the proposed extension would not project as far. Indeed, with its matching hipped roof, it seems to me that the scheme would provide a staggered transition of building forms as seen along this approach which would not be inappropriate. Overall, therefore, I find that the scheme would not be obtrusive in the street scene.

8. These factors lead me to find that the appeal proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or surrounding area,