Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1068/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 78 Gardner Road, Southwick, Brighton

Proposal: Single storey rear extension to west elevation.

Date of site visit: 30.08.16

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposal

The application relates to an end of terrace two storey property in a street of similar dwellings in Southwick. Permission was originally sought for a single-storey flat-roof addition 4 metres in depth from the rear of the original dwelling. There is an existing lean-to at the rear of the dwelling which would be removed, this would have formed an original part of the building and are common features on many of the properties in the locality. The extension was shown as the full width of the dwelling at 5.8 metres wide and 2.8 metres high. The extension was also shown on the originally submitted drawings as being attached to an extension at the adjacent dwelling, No 80. This extension has not been built and works have not commenced however it was labelled on the plans as being a permitted prior approval application for a 4 metre deep extension.

The applicant was advised that as this adjacent extension had not been constructed this current proposal could not be shown as being attached to it. Also the depth of the proposed extension at this site, no. 78 at 4 metres could not be supported in the light of there being no extension adjacent. An assessment would have to be made in the light of the current situation and a 4 metre deep extension built up to the boundary with an attached dwelling would have a detrimental impact with regards to loss of light and over bearing impact. Development Control Standard No. 3 states that such extensions can only be supported up to 3.5 metres in depth.

In the circumstances it was recommended that the applicant's agent should withdraw the application and resubmit a joint planning application which showed both the extension at no. 78 and no. 80 at 4 metres in depth and attached. Then a condition could be attached to ensure that both extensions would have to be built together to overcome any issues with regards to harm to residential amenity if only one extension were to be built. Alternatively there was the option of reducing the proposal to 3.5 metres and showing it as being built within the boundaries of no. 78 the application site. Amended plans have been submitted to show the latter and are the subject of this application.

Consultations: None undertaken.

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
Submission Adur Local Plan 2016 Policy 15
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extension which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The extension is to the rear of the dwelling and is not visible within the street scene. At 3.5 metres in depth and of flat roof design it is a modest sized extension in keeping in scale and appearance with the main dwelling. The materials will be conditioned to match existing.

Residential Amenity

There is no extension adjacent at the attached dwelling no. 80 Gardner Road. The original rear projection remains as at the application site. Consent has been granted for a 4 metre deep extension at no. 80 under prior approval yet no work has commenced at the time of the site visit. The proposal as amended must therefore be considered upon its own merits in the light of the existing circumstances. It is not considered that an extension at 3.5 metres in depth built up to the boundary will have any significant adverse impact upon the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling.

Other Matters

There is an overly large tree to the rear of no. 78 and 80 it is not clear within which boundary. It is however likely that this tree will need to be significantly pruned or removed should the works go ahead. The occupiers should discuss this amongst themselves; it is however not considered that the loss of this tree would be detrimental to the visual or residential amenities of the locality.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. Time limit
2. Materials to match existing
3. No windows or openings on the southern elevation.
4. Approved plans

Informative

1. Proactive with amendment

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 15th November 2016

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 15.11.2016