DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/0768/11

Site: **21 Croft Avenue Southwick Brighton West Sussex**

Proposal: **Single-storey rear extension with roof-lights (conservatory removed)**

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS: N

PROPOSAL, SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application property comprises one half of a pair of attractive mid-20C houses on the north side of Croft Avenue. It has previously been enlarged by a rear conservatory and there is a detached brick-built garage set back into the rear garden on the west side. There is a timber-framed pergola to the north side of the conservatory overgrown with vines.

The surrounding area is primarily residential in character, located to the south and east of Southwick town centre.

Permission is sought for a single-storey rear extension to replace the existing conservatory. It would be 7.1m wide and 4.5m deep with a pitched roof having a central ridge 3.8m high, sloping down to 2.4m high eaves on either side. The walls would be constructed in brickwork with a rendered panel at the rear.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY None.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

Saved Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7
DC Standard 3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
South East Plan: CC1, CC6, BE1

RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND REPRESENTATIONS:

EHO (Contaminated Land Officer) recommends a condition advising in relation to possible contamination.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

The proposal comprises up-grading of the existing housing stock located within the built-up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers, the design of the extension and effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

The above Standard states that on semi-detached dwellings, single-storey rear extensions which abut or are within 1m of a common side boundary with an attached dwelling should be normally no deeper than 3.5m. In this case the proposed extension is 4.5m deep, the same overall depth as the existing conservatory although the latter has a chamfered corner. The attached property to the east, No.23, has not been extended and includes an original bay window feature on the ground-floor rear elevation adjacent to the common boundary. The bay window serves a habitable room with French doors opening out into the garden and obscure-glazed, leaded lights in the angled side panels. The obscure-glazed side panels have the effect of restricting the outlook from the room.

The proposed extension would have a greater 'bulk' than the existing conservatory and consequently would have a more enclosing effect on the rear outlook from No.23. However, the extent of overshadowing would be little different to the existing situation bearing in mind the combined effect of the existing conservatory and pergola covered in planting. On balance, despite its depth, having regard to the restricted outlook from the most affected room at No.23, it is considered the effect of the proposed extension on the amenities of the occupiers would not be so severe as to warrant refusal.

There are no windows proposed in the east side wall of the extension. There would be a glazed door and side light in the west side facing onto the drive, but would not overlook the accommodation of No.19, which owing to the staggered building line is sited further to the south.

Design and the effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The scale of the extension is not out of keeping with this generously proportioned semi-detached house and constitutes a sympathetic form of rear extension. It would not be visible from the street.

RECOMMENDATION APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and subject to the conditions of this planning permission can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the 'saved' policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7), and the policies of the South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1).

SUBJECT TO:-

1. Standard time limit (3 yrs)
2. Approved drawings
3. Matching brickwork and roof materials, plus rendered panel in rear
4. No windows in east side wall

Informative: precautionary contamination

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?

No

Delegated Decision

Case Officer
Sign……J Morin…….Date…8 Dec 2011……..

Authorising Officer

Sign……P Barnett……..Date……9 Dec 2011……..