

## **Development Management – Delegated Officer Report**

**Application Number: AWDM/1587/25 Recommendation: APPROVE**

**Site: 45 The Crescent, Southwick, West Sussex**

**Proposal: Proposed two storey side extension**

**Date of Site Visit: 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2026**

**Neighbours Checked: Y**

**Additional neighbour notification: N**

### **Proposal, Site and Surroundings**

The application site is located within the built up area of Southwick on the north side of The Crescent. The street comprises of similar style 1930s semi detached, two storey dwellings. As existing there is a two storey rear projection and single storey infill extension adjacent to the boundary. There is a detached, single flat roof garage to the side of the dwelling which is to be demolished. There is off street parking to the front.

Permission is sought to add a two storey side extension extending the full depth to the rear of the existing two storey projection. The ground floor is in line with the front wall of the house, and the first floor has a slight set back. Amended plans have been received to show the ridge reduced down from the existing ridge to give a more subservient appearance, in line with officer advice.

The extensions create storage to the front at ground floor with a garage door with a snug, utility and shower room. At first floor a master bedroom to the rear with en suite, family bathroom and bedroom to the front.

**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 (December 2024)  
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

### **Planning Assessment**

#### **Principle**

The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

#### **Visual amenity**

The main property to be affected is no. 47 to the east. This dwelling has been extended in a similar fashion under AWDM/0625/20 and amended under AWDM/0293/21.

The proposed extension is similar in design, with a set back to the front, lower ridge height and set in from the side boundary. The proposed side extension at the application site generally complies with Development Management Standard No. 2 which requires a subservient appearance.

The set in from the side boundary allows for spacing between the buildings to avoid a terracing effect. However it is noted that at the front there is a minimum distance of 0.79 metres so this slightly falls short of the 1 metre standard. However due to the angle of the boundary this distance does increase to 1 metre and greater to the rear. On balance this is considered acceptable, the development will not lead to a terracing effect and sufficient distance will remain between the buildings. No. 47 has already constructed a two storey extension so this gap is unlikely to be reduced further. This case however should not set a precedent for other similar development. Each case should be judged on its own merits and it is important to consider the spacing and distances between buildings within a general context.

The first floor set back is slightly less than no. 47 adjacent, however on balance this still complies with Development Management Standards as it is a subservient, set back addition. It also has a neater roof form and is not harmful in this case.

Materials to be used will match existing to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and street scene. There is much variation within the street with many examples of side and front extensions visible. There is another similar example of a two storey side extension nearby at no. 39, permitted under ADC/0339/10.

### **Residential amenity**

The main property to be affected is no. 47 to the east. As stated above there is a two storey side extension here. Both extensions are set in from the boundary so there is spacing between the dwellings. There are windows on the side elevation of no. 47, these serve ensembles. They are obscurely glazed with high level openers. As existing these face onto the side of the application site and there are first floor windows here currently. The proposed extension will bring the side elevations closer and windows are proposed here, both serving shower/bathrooms so will be obscurely glazed and high level opening. There will be a distance here in excess of 2 metres between the windows due to the angle of the boundary. It is considered that there will not be any significant overlooking here which would warrant a refusal in this case. There will also not be any harmful loss of light, these windows serve non habitable rooms. There are ground floor windows proposed to the side however these will be screened by the boundary fence and there are no side windows adjacent, only a side door therefore no overlooking will occur.

The extension is the same depth as that at no. 47 projecting no further to the rear, therefore there will be no loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact in this case upon the occupiers of no. 47 The Crescent.

The attached dwelling is of similar design as the application site. The extension is the other side of the existing rear projection so therefore it will be screened from this property by the existing house. Therefore there will be no harm in this case.

### **Recommendation**

APPROVE

### **Subject to Conditions:-**

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials to match existing
4. No additional windows or openings on the east elevation.
5. The side bathroom and shower room windows shall be fitted with obscured glazed min level 3 at all times and shall be high level opening only.

### **Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation N**

1. Proactive with amendments

Case Officer: Hannah Barker

Date: 26<sup>th</sup> February 2026

Authorised by: Peter Barnett

Date: 26 February 2026