Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0256/15 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 44 Silverdale Drive Sompting Lancing West Sussex

Proposal: Two-storey side extension with attached garage

Date of site visit: 05.03.2015

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property comprises a semi-detached 2-storey house (c. 1964) occupying a corner plot at the junction of Silverdale Drive with Cokeham Lane. There is a detached garage and detached pitched-roof outbuilding to the north side. The site is slightly elevated in relation to Cokeham Lane.

Permission is sought for a 2-storey side extension and attached garage on the north side (to replace the existing garage and outbuilding).

Consultations:

Sompting Parish Council supports this application.

Representations:

A letter has been received from the occupier of 2 Greentrees Crescent stating they have no objection to the proposal.

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’ National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012).

Planning Assessment

Principle

There is no objection in principle to the proposed development which is supported by saved policy AH7 subject to the extension having an acceptable appearance in-keeping with the character of the area and there being no adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Visual amenity

Silverdale Drive is made up of pairs of semi-detached houses with garages to the side and open-plan frontages. The building line staggers to reflect the curvature of the road, but a strong sense of visual cohesion is derived from the distinctive built form. The application site constitutes a wider than average site at the northern end of the road. The boundary onto Cokeham Lane is defined by a tall hedge beyond which is a wide highway verge.

The proposed 2-storey side extension is 4m wide and the attached single-storey garage a further 3.3m wide. The extension would have a pitched and gabled roof formed by a continuation of the existing ridge northwards. As originally submitted, the proposal included a single-storey front-projecting element to the garage and side extension linking through to form a replacement entrance porch with lean-to roof.

The above SPG states that 2-storey side extensions should normally be set back from the main front wall of the dwelling to create a visual break and ensure the extension is subordinate to the main dwelling. In this case the proposed extension is not set back from the front although a visual break is created in the form of a brickwork pier (comprising the remnant of the original flank wall). A similar form of 2-storey extension – positioned flush with the front elevation - exists on the opposite side of the road at No.57, and also further south at No.39. The most discordant element of the initially submitted proposal was considered to be the single-storey front projection/replacement porch and part–pitched part flat-roofed garage which would have appeared as prominent and alien features interrupting the existing sense of cohesiveness and rhythm which is derived from the distinctive flat-roofed form of the original garages and porches in this road.

Following discussions amended drawings have been received omitting the single-storey front element/replacement porch and replacing the part pitched/part flat-roof of the attached garage with a flat roof. The amended drawings show the proposed garage and ground-floor element of the side extension projecting at the rear (east) by a further 1.8m compared to the original submission. The amended proposals will relate more sympathetically to the character of existing development in this road.

Residential amenity

There would be no adverse impact on the amenities of the occupiers of the attached house to the south, No.42. The main ‘bulk’ of the proposed development will be sited to the north side of the existing house except for the single-storey rear protrusion shown on the amended plan which would be some 5.5m distant from the common boundary. There is no window shown in the south side of this element and this can be secured by a condition of planning permission.

The extension on this ‘peninsula’ site would be clearly visible in views from the nearest dwellings on the north side of Cokeham Lane (No.53 and 55) and on the corner of Greentrees Crescent (No.2) but at a minimum distance of 25m could not be considered to be intrusive. The first-floor windows in the north elevation of the 2-storey extension are shown as obscure-glazed high

level windows, but in view of the separation distance surrounding properties it would be difficult to justify a condition making this a requirement.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. 3 yr time limit
2. Approved Plans
3. Matching materials and windows
4. No windows in s.side single-storey rear element
5. Accommodation to be ancillary to existing dwelling

Informative

1. Proactive Statement – With Amendments

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 15.04.2015

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 15 April 2015