Expiry Date – 14th November

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1136/12 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 58 Overhill, Southwick

Proposal: **Single storey side extension linking existing garage to house.**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a detached bungalow on the east side of Overhill opposite the junction with Holmbush Way. Overhill climbs up from the south steeply. No. 60 to the north is another detached bungalow on higher ground. Between the two houses are paired garages with mock pitched roofs. They are detached from each house and separated from each by a 3.3 metre gap which allows rear garden access.

These properties have their front doors in the side walls and there are a number of examples of houses with similarly paired garages in the street on this side of the road. Elsewhere houses have shared drives with paired garages to the rear.

The property is not in a conservation area and it is not a listed building.

Relevant Planning History

0760/07 – Conservatory on north side. Granted 4.2.08.

Consultations

The ***Environmental Health*** officer has no objection but would like to see the precautionary contamination condition added to any approval.

Representations

None received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (DCLG 2012)
South East Plan (GOSE 2009): SCT1, BE1, CC1
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.

Planning Assessment

Principle

Where proposed extensions do not have a significant impact on neighbour or visual amenity and do not harm the character of an area they are generally considered to be acceptable.

General Character

The general character of these particular bungalows is for them to have their front doors in the side wall with detached paired garages between. The proposal will link the garage to the house and move the side door to the front wall of the extension. No other such extensions were noted in the near vicinity, though properties have been altered particularly at roof level.

The garage is set back behind the front wall of the house by 5.5 metres and on raised ground level of approximately 0.5 metre. The eaves line of the mock pitch on the garage is slightly higher than that of the house. The proposal has been revised to bring the eaves line of the extension in line with the house and not the garage. This is an improvement. The applicant was asked to remove the porch element of the proposal which would set the extension back behind the garage and leave the front door in its original position in the side wall, he declined to do this. This is regrettable and will alter the original character of this bungalow. However, it is not considered to be so harmful as to justify a refusal.

Visual amenity

Policy AH7 (b) of the Adur District Local Plan requires extensions to be of a design and materials sympathetic to the original dwelling and the area in general. DC Standard No. 3 states that any extension should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and street scene generally.

The proposed extension is to be built in matching materials and the reduced scale of the extension means it is broadly sympathetic to the original dwelling.

Residential amenity

The proposed extension sits well off the boundary with No. 60, to the north and at a lower level. It extends only 2 metres beyond the rear wall of the garage and house. It will have no neighbour impact for occupiers of No. 60. It is well removed from No. 56.

Conclusion

A better scheme was encouraged but not achieved. The revised scheme with the reduced eaves is better than the original scheme and is not so harmful as to warrant refusal.

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. It would consequently not conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework, South East Plan policies (SCT1, CC6, BE1) and 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.

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Approved Plans
3. External materials to match existing

Informatives

This site is situated on or adjacent to a site which has been identified through Adur and Worthing Councils Contaminated Land Inspection Strategy as having the potential to be contaminated. During development of land potentially affected by contamination, it is the responsibility of the owner and developer to establish the extent of any potentially harmful material on this site.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: MOK Date: 19/11/12

Authorised and signed by: P Devonport Date: 19.11.12