Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0103/17 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 11 Downland Avenue Southwick Brighton

Proposal: Single storey side and rear extension to north and east elevations.

Date of site visit: 13.02.17

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposals

The application relates to a semi-detached two storey dwelling. It is within a street of similar dwellings. There is an existing conservatory to the rear of the building, adjacent to the boundary with the attached dwelling. This conservatory is to be removed. Consent is sought for a side and rear 'wrap around' extension, single storey of flat roof design.

The extension will form an entrance porch to the side with the main entrance and a W.C and to the rear an extended kitchen and utility. The extension is 2.1 metres wide to the side, has a maximum depth of 8.2 metres to the side, reducing to 3 metres to the rear. It has a maximum width of 7.6 metres and is 2.9 metres high.

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
Adur Submission Local Plan Policy 15
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extension which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The main part of the extension is to the rear and is therefore is not visible within the street scene. Yet the narrow side section will be visible from the front of the dwelling. There is a set-back of 1.9 metres from the front of the dwelling. This is at a similar

position to the existing side extension at the adjacent property which has a mono-pitch roof and is just set inside the boundary with the application site. It is considered that the scale of the extension, combined with its set-back when viewed from the highway allows the extension to be subservient to the main dwelling. Its flat roof design limits the scale and bulk of the extension yet does not give rise to the best of design solutions here. A more sympathetic approach could be adopted here yet, on balance in the light of the set back and the adjacent extension it would allow for a simple design solution here. The flat roof design would not warrant a refusal here.

Residential Amenity

The dwellings directly either side of the site are affected here. As existing there is a conservatory built up to the boundary with the attached dwelling no. 9. This has a solid side wall. The proposed extension will be a matching depth of 3 metres and will also have a solid side wall. It is not considered that the impact of the proposed extension would be significantly greater than existing. A condition is attached to ensure that do openings are formed in this elevation of the extension. It should also be noted that as the depth of the extension here is limited to 3 metres that this complies with the Council's Development Control Standards which state that 3.5 metres should not be exceeded in cases such as this. Therefore no loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact results in this case.

With regards to the side extension this runs adjacent to the boundary of no. 15 to the east and is 8.2 metres deep here. However the extension does abut a similar development with a side main entrance created and solid side boundary. There are no side windows at the existing property that would be impacted. There is an existing W.C window shown on the side boundary of the proposed extension. This was originally shown to be openable on the originally submitted plans. It was considered that due to the proximity to the boundary and that no certificate B had been submitted that this should be queried with the applicant's agent. Amended plans have been received and are for consideration here. There is also a condition to restrict any further openings on this elevation. There will be no significant loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact that would warrant a refusal in this case.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. Standard time limit
2. materials to match existing
3. no openings on the east or west elevation.
4. approved plans

Informative

1. proactive with revisions

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 27th February 2017

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 27.02.2017