31/3/08.

# Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: ADC/0074/08** **Recommendation – Refuse Application**

**Site:** **30 Milton Drive Southwick Brighton West Sussex**

**Proposal:** **Single-storey side extension and front porch**

## The Application

The application site is the western half of a semi-detached pair of hip roofed bungalows located on the north side of Milton Drive, Southwick. The property has a rear west side garage and a large single storey rear extension, and is separated from a detached bungalow to the west by an access road to rear allotments. The street consists of similar semi-detached pairs of bungalows to the east and detached bungalows to the west.
This application seeks permission to erect a side extension 2.8 metres in width and 3.6 metres in depth off the front west side, and a new porch off the front elevation. The side extension will be hip roofed and will follow the lines of the existing small front bedroom protrusion with an identical front facing bay window. The porch will also be hip roofed with a front bay feature and will extend 1.1 metres forward of the main building line from the recessed front door.

## Consultations and Representations

### Third Parties

No representations have been received.

### Contributors

No representations have been received.

## Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005): LOC1, DEV1
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved until adoption of the new Adur Development Plan): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'

## 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. DC standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' states that side extensions should be set back at least 1 metre from the boundary and also set back from the front elevation in order to appear subordinate to the main dwelling. Side extensions clearly visible from the road should be designed to closely match the existing dwelling.

The same DC standard states that front extensions/porches will only be allowed where they can be successfully assimilated into the streetscene without unduly affecting neighbours.

***Visual Amenity***

The proposed side extension will extend the front bedroom protrusion 2.8 metres to the west to within 0.4 metres of the side/rear access road boundary. Although the extension encroaches to within 0.4 metres of the boundary, less than the 1 metre DC standard requirement, there is sufficient distance to the neighbouring bungalow to avoid the appearance of it being a cramped overdevelopment of the plot.

It will not however be subordinate to the front elevation and, due to the considerable separation between the applicant's bungalow and the nearest property to the west (8 metres), it will be a highly visible feature that will clearly unbalance the pair of bungalows. All the semi-detached pairs within the street have these front protrusions of alternate length. The extension in width of one would be out of character with the design of the bungalows and would thus be a clear discordant feature within the street. It is noted that there is a similar sized side extension on a corner plot opposite at No.17 however this was constructed in 1989 prior to the adoption of the current local plan and DC standards in 1996, and is thus not deemed to create a precedent.

It is therefore considered that a side extension directly on the forwardmost section of the bungalow, with a matching bay window, creates a highly visible and incongruous feature that is detrimental to the character of the bungalow pair and the streetscene, contrary to local plan policy AH7.

The front porch is hip roofed and bay fronted with glazing on all sides above a 0.9 metre dwarf wall. It will extend 1.1 metres beyond the front building line. Several of the other bungalows in the immediate area have small porches that do not break the building line of the property and appear moderate against the host dwelling. Although the building line along the north side of Milton Drive steps away to the east, it is considered that the porch will protrude to an extent that is detrimental to the appearance of the bungalows and the street in general.

***Residential Amenity***
Although the bungalow at No.28 to the west has a side window that will face the extension, there is good separation between the opposing flank walls. The proposal will thus not impact on outlook or light to this property. No side windows are proposed in the extension so there will be no privacy concerns.

## Recommendation

REFUSE on ground that :-

B5BR: 'The proposed extension and porch, by reason of their unsympathetic ~~design~~ architectural relationship, would be out of keeping with the existing building....'

Case Officer:.....

Date: 6/3/08

PB 10/3/08