Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – Approve**
AWDM/0231/12

Site: **46 Cross Road, Southwick, West Sussex BN42 4HJ**

Proposal: **Single storey rear and side extension**

Date of site visit: 28.02.12

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: Yes, after submission of amended plans

Proposal, Site and Surroundings
The application relates to an end of terrace Victorian two-storey house located on the east side of the road. The dwelling has a ridged roof with a gabled end to the south-east side, and a two-storey rear projection, shared with the attached neighbour to the north-west (No.48). The side of the rear projection is separated from the south-east side boundary by 1.7m, where a 1.8m high fence and 2.2m high hedge separate the site from the adjacent neighbour (No.44).

Permission is sought for a single-storey 'L' shaped extension that would wrap around the side and rear of the existing rear projection. The extension would have a mono-pitched roof (with flat roofed top) and would be in a rendered exterior finish. The extension would be 7.2m in depth (3.1m from the rearmost part of the existing building), by 4.4m – 1.4m in width, and 2.3m in height to the eaves.

The attached property has been extended to the rear with a clear-glazed conservatory 2.5m in depth, which is separated from the site by a standard 1.6m high panelled fence and a gap of 0.5m. To the SE the neighbour is separated from the site by a pedestrian access, and as described a fence and hedge, both on the boundary between the two sites. The hedge is mature and thick and continues some distance into the rear garden as the boundary. The fence section is two panels wide (approximately 3.5m) and is located from the rear of the main dwelling until the hedge starts. The rooms in the side of the adjacent house (No.44) serve a lounge, with two high level, circular side windows (with shaped patterned clear glass), and a utility room. The lounge has a second outlook to the NE into the rear garden and small patio of the property through full height patio doors.

Relevant site history

Representations

Third parties: The occupiers of No.44 Cross Road have written in objection of the proposed scheme on the grounds that they do not want to lose the

existing boundary hedge which will screen the proposed extension. Any footings will necessitate the destruction of the boundary hedge which they find unacceptable. The bullseye windows in the side of their building have clear glass and let in ambient light and a decorative outlook from their sitting room. The proposed new building will reduce the light by overbearing these windows to a greater height than the current hedge and fence.

The objectors mention a number of inaccuracies within the application regarding the location of the boundary line, and thus the encroachment of their property with the gutters, the location of the hedge, and how far the extension will project. *[NB: Amended plans drawn to scale have been submitted which indicate a stepped boundary line, no encroachment and the location of the hedge.]*

Relevant Planning Policies
Adopted 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'
South East Plan (GOSE 2009): CC1, CC6, BE1
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Visual amenity
The proposed extension would effectively wrap around the rear two-storey projection of the original building in an 'L' shaped manner. It would project beyond the rearmost part of the building by 3.1m, and would be inset from the SW boundary and the flank wall of the house. The proposed extension would have a rendered painted finish to the exterior and would have a mainly plain tiled roof. Given that the proposals would be very well screened from the main highway it is not considered that the extension would result in a harmful impact on the appearance of the streetscene as a whole.

The extension would be a sympathetic design to the form and appearance of the original dwelling, and whilst it would in fill the gap to the side of the existing rear projection, it does not project past its rear to such an extent that it would appear overly large or out of scale for the size of the house.

It is appreciated that constructing the extension would result in the loss of a portion of the hedge that currently separates the site from the objectors own dwelling. It is unclear where the hedge (most likely a privet) is growing, and there are likely to be multiple main stems to it, growing in and around the boundary line. The ownership of the hedge is a civil matter and not under specific consideration in this application. The applicant has confirmed that a new fence can be re-instated along the entire side of the proposed extension, and that the remainder of the hedge will be protected during the construction process.

The existing hedge provides screening and privacy to the neighbouring site, and whilst views through one of the high level circular windows are currently towards the hedge, the remainder of the hedge would remain, and views of

the mature rear garden from the rear of the neighbour's lounge would be unchanged. It is therefore not considered that the visual amenity of the area would be so detrimentally affected that it would warrant refusal.

Residential amenity
The proposed extension would project beyond the neighbours (No.48) rear conservatory by 0.6m, and beyond the main rear elevation of the property by 3.1m. The flank wall of the extension would be 2.7m in height and would have a parapet design, with a rendered finish. There would be a separation to the side of the neighbour's conservatory of 0.5m which would enable the external treatment of the flank wall to be completed, and to prevent a particularly overbearing appearance. Whilst there are some views from the conservatory over the boundary fence currently, in the main they are towards the rear garden. The proposed extension complies with the Councils DC Standard which allows a maximum extension distance of 3.5m at the rear of attached properties and it is therefore felt that there would not be a harmful impact on the outlook of the rear of No.48, or an unacceptable impact on their amount of natural daylight.

The neighbour to the SE has objected for the reasons that the proposed extension would reduce the amount of light to their rear lounge by being overbearing and obstructing existing views. Whilst it is appreciated the views from the side circular windows would be altered to be at the relatively blank wall and fence (if implemented), the main outlook from the room is into the rear garden. The extension would be to the NW of these windows so there would not be an impact on direct sunlight to the side of their lounge, however the appearance of the built form, and to a lesser degree its height (2.2m to the eaves) of the extension, adjacent to the boundary would be a distinct contrast to the physical appearance of the existing fence (1.8m) and hedge (2.2m) combination currently there. Given that the extension itself would only project beyond the rear elevation of No.44 by 1.1m and that there would be a separation of 2m from the side of their building it is considered that the impact on the outlook and levels of daylight to the lounge are unlikely to be significantly altered.

The proposed extension is intended to serve an enlarged kitchen / family room with bi-fold doors into the rear garden of the property. Given that no additional windows are proposed in the side of the extension and that it is to remain as a domestic dwelling it is not considered that the resultant use would impact on the levels of privacy currently experienced to either of the adjacent neighbours.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed extension 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 saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) or the policies of the South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1)

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Materials to match existing dwelling etc
3. No windows or other openings in NW or SE side walls of the extension etc
4. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Drawing No: 1:125 Site Location Plan. Date Received: 29.04.12
   Drawing No: 1:500 Block Plan. Date Received: 29.04.12.
   Drawing No: Proposed and Existing Elevations, Floor Plans, and sections. Date Received: 29.04.12.

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

Case Officer: C. Hone Date: 21.05.12.

Authorised by: P. Barnett Date: 21.05.12