Expiry 05/09

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0359/08 **Recommendation - Permit**

Site: **15 Croft Avenue Southwick Brighton West Sussex**

Proposal: **Two-storey west side extension with rear projection (incorporating replacement garage)**

The Application

The application property is a detached 1950's house located on the north side of Croft Avenue within the built up area of Southwick. The house has previously been extended with a rear conservatory and a west side attached garage.

The proposals are for a west side two-storey extension.

The road is characterised by large detached and semi-detached houses of a similar age, all which are well set back from the road. A number have been previously extended with single storey rear extensions, and only one has extended in the space at the side to two-storey level (No.33). To the west of the site is Elmcroft a three-storey residential care-home built with bedroom and bathroom windows on the east elevation at upper levels, and an attached single-storey block on the east with a blank brick built side wall. To the east is No.17 a semi detached house separated from the site by a driveway and detached garage.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: There has been one letter of support received from the owner of No.17 (the neighbour to the east), who feels that the proposals will result in an improved outlook.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005) (saved policies): LOC1, DEV1
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.'
PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies

Structure Plan policies seek to protect and, where possible enhance the character and distinctiveness of areas, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). Policy AH7 of the Local Plan, in relation specifically to extensions and alterations to dwellings, states that they should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable loss of light or privacy or have an overbearing effect on the neighbouring dwellings and be sympathetic to the original dwelling. Supplementary Planning Guidance in DC Standard No. 3 'Extension and Alteration to Dwellings' states that two-storey side extensions should usually retain a 1 metre gap to the boundary to prevent a terracing effect or a cramped appearance within the plot, and that they should be slightly set-back to retain a subservient appearance. A rear extension should also allow the retention of garden area of at least 11 metres in depth. Two-storey extensions should also have a pitched roof to match the existing house.

Visual amenity

The two-storey extension as originally submitted would have projected past the front elevation of the existing building by 1.4m which is contrary to the above guidance as set out in the Development Control Standard. Although the integration of the front projection via a canopy roof would have been visually acceptable from the east, it was felt that the long blank flank wall with part-hipped gable would have resulted in a dominant and overbearing extension that would have made the house look cramped within the site.

The applicant has amended the scheme and now the proposed extension would be set back from the front elevation of the original building by 0.4m; would have a hipped roof; and has four west side windows.

It is now considered that the extension would appear subservient to the original dwelling in compliance with the above DC Standard, and would have visual interest as viewed from the west preventing it from appearing overly large. In addition it would have a roof form that is sympathetic to the original dwelling. Visually it is felt the scaled down proposals would not result in the house from appearing cramped or dominated by the extension.

It is usual for a 1.0m gap to be retained between the boundary and the proposed extension, this is to prevent a terracing effect and a cramped appearance, however in this instance only 0.25m is retained. Due to the separation between the boundary and the three-storey care home being 7.0m it is felt that enough space is retained to prevent a cramped appearance. The difference in building type between the Elmcroft care home and the application house would prevent a terracing effect.

Residential amenity

The applicant has included windows on the west side of the extension (at the Officers request) to create visual interest in what otherwise would be a large blank brick wall. The two first-floor windows would serve bathrooms and

provided they were obscurely glazed would not result in a loss of privacy or overlooking. The two-ground floor windows would serve the garage and day-room, both would be partially obscured by the existing boundary fence and would face directly toward the blank flank wall of the single-storey side projection of Elmcroft. It is not felt that these windows would require obscurely glazing.

The proposed extension would project past the rear elevation of the existing house by 4.2m. This additional bulk at first-storey level (the garage currently occupies a similar footprint) would be directly opposite obscurely glazed bathroom windows in the east side of Elmcroft, and it is felt that they would not suffer from loss of light, outlook or privacy. The neighbour to the east is located some distance from where the extension would be and again it is felt they would not suffer from any loss of residential amenity.

The garden is 57m long and very well screened on the west side which would prevent any serious overlooking of the Elmcroft site from the north facing bedroom window.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPii

1. C1Ci
2. C14Ai (11/08/08 – AH7 of the ADLP and DEV1 of the WSSP)
3. C18Civ – amended
   The windows in the west side elevation at first-floor level serving the two bathrooms shall at all times...etc.
4. C18Eii (West and East)
5. C12Eii

Case Officer: [illegible]
Date: 19.08.08

PB 20/8/08