Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application expiry: 17.04.07

Application Number: ADC/0101/07 **Recommendation - Permit**

Site: **32 Trent Close Sompting Lancing West Sussex**

Proposal: **Garage and utility room attached to north side**

The Application

The application property is northern half of a pair of semi-detached houses on the west side of Trent Close. The property is sited adjacent to a open pathway which serves as pedestrian access to No's 33 - 35 Trent Close and No's 21 – 25 Test Road to the north where the land which slopes from the east up to the west.

The proposal is for a garage and utility room which would be attached to the north side of the existing building, replacing the existing flat roofed detached garage and garden shed.

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

EDF Energy Networks Ltd - No objection to the proposal, providing their rights regarding access and maintenance to any of their cables are maintained at all times.

Sompting Parish Council - No objection.

Third Parties

There has been no neighbour objections to the proposed developments.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (WSCC 2005): DEV1, DEV4-5.
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7, AT12
And Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising:- Dev Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

Planning Assessment

The main concerns of the proposal are the effect the development would have on the visual amenity of the area, and how it would relate to the existing dwelling, in terms of its scale and appearance.

Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' states, when addressing side extensions specifically, that when they are

clearly visible from the road they should be designed to closely match the existing dwelling. In particular they should have a roof in keeping with the existing dwelling, they should be set back slightly from the main front wall to create a visual break ensuring the extension is subordinate to the main dwelling and to avoid difficulty in matching materials. It also states that very wide extensions should be avoided as they would usually be out of scale with the existing dwelling and spoil its proportions.

Although the existing detached garage has a flat roof and is sited in front of the east side building line of the dwelling, it was felt that the proposed extension would appear far too dominant for the size of the house that it would be attached to. The gradient of the land would have resulted in the side wall of the utility room being up to 3.4m in height as opposed to the 2.8m of the garage section. This stepped up roof line would have looked out of keeping with the original building and the surrounding area.

The applicant's agent has now amended the plans to prevent the proposed garage and utility room from being too overpowering and out of keeping.

The proposal would now have a ridged roof running east to west with a gable at each end, matching the design of the original house with boxed in eaves. The ridge would run horizontally resulting in the utility room being at a lower level than that of the rear of the property. To allow access to the kitchen from the utility room a small pitched roof approximately the width of the door would join the garage roof to the north elevation of the house to allow for head clearance. The width of the extension has been reduced to 4.1m and the front has been stepped back from the building line by 0.3m. The rear of the proposal would protrude past the rear of the building by 0.5m to ensure the eaves and guttering can be accommodated adequately. The reduction in width of the garage/utility would now mean the existing boundary wall can be retained.

It is considered that the amendments to the design effectively address the concerns over the proposals dominance and incongruity and are now considered to be acceptable.

The proposal would not have an adverse effect on the amount of light or privacy available to the surrounding properties.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :- 1PPii

1. C1Ci.
2. C14Ai – amended.
   This permission relates to the amended plan (Rev. A) received on 29.03.07 and not to the plan originally submitted.
   Reason: *For the avoidance of doubt and because the application as originally submitted was unacceptable having regard to policy*

AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan and DEV1 of the West Sussex Structure Plan.

3. C12Eii
4. C8Fi

Case Officer:
Date: 29.03.07