Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0082/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 20 Whitelot Way Southwick Brighton West Sussex

Proposal: Single-storey rear extension to east elevation.

Date of site visit: 06.04.2016

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a mid-C20, semi-detached house located on the east side of Whitelot Way. This semi-detached pair (with No.22 attached to the north) is asymmetric in form with No.22 is sited on higher ground. No.18, a semi-detached house of a different design to 20/22 adjoins on lower ground to the south.

The surrounding area is residential in character. Surrounding land slopes steeply up to the north.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single-storey rear extension across the full width of the rear elevation. Owing to an original protruding element on the north side of the rear, the depth of the proposed extension would vary between 3 and 4.1metres. It would have a flat roof 2.9m high with a roof lantern (1.1m x 2.4m) over the southern part.

Consultations:

Southern Water comments that the proposals appear to involve building over a public sewer, but that it might be possible to divert the sewer subject to certain stipulations. The applicant is advised to discuss the matter further with Southern Water. In addition, an informative is requested advising that a formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required. .

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
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 size of the proposed single-storey extension is in keeping with the scale of this 2-storey dwelling. A rear garden depth of 14m would be retained.

Oblique views of the rear extension may be possible from the street through the narrow gap between No.18 and 20, but will not have a dominant or intrusive effect on the street-scene.

Residential Amenity

The above SPG requires that single-storey extensions to semi-detached and terraced properties which adjoin a side boundary should not exceed 3.5m in depth in order to avoid having an adverse effect on the daylighting and outlook of neighbouring properties.

The variation in the depth of the proposed extension arises due to a narrow rear projection some 1.1m deep on the rear of the original dwelling. There is no similar protrusion on the attached property, No.22. Consequently the proposed extension would extend 4.1m beyond the nearest part of the rear elevation of No.22 which at ground-floor includes a pair of French doors (clearly serving a habitable room). The boundary on this side is defined by 2m high close-boarded fencing. The heads of the French doors are visible above the top of the fence. The submitted drawings are incorrect inasmuch that they do not accurately show that the eaves of No.22 are higher than No.20. The fact that the heads of windows/doors do not 'line-through' indicates that the floor level at No.22 is higher than at No.20. As a consequence, the height of the proposed extension will have a lesser impact on the receipt of daylight to, and outlook from the French doors of No.22 than if the floor levels were the same in both properties. In the circumstances, although the proposed extension exceeds the minimum depth stipulated in the Council's SPG by 0.6m, it would be difficult to argue that the effect would be so oppressive or enclosing, or result in such severe loss of daylight as to warrant refusal on residential amenity grounds. No objection has been received from the neighbour at No.22.

The adjoining property to the south, No.18 is situated on lower ground. It has been extended at the rear by a single-storey extension approximately 3.5m deep. There are 3 windows in the north flank wall of the original dwelling, the largest of which, sited towards the rear (east) serves the kitchen. A narrow passageway approximately 1m wide separates the flank walls of either dwelling from the common boundary, defined at this point by low chain-link fencing. Bearing in mind the lower ground level of No.18, the 'bulk' of the proposed extension will have some effect on daylighting to, and outlook from the kitchen window in particular. However, given the relative position of the window to the proposed extension, this impact would not be significantly relieved by reducing the overall depth of the extension to 3.5m In fact a similar

impact would arise from an extension built as permitted development under the provisions of the GDPO.

It is noted that the kitchen at No.18 appears to open into an open-plan area within the extension to that property which has doors/windows facing the garden. In the circumstances and in the absence of any objection from the neighbour it is considered refusal would not be justified on grounds of harm to the amenities of No.18.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Matching materials
4. No side windows.

Informative

1. Pro-active – No Amendment
2. Southern Water

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 11.04.2016

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 11 April 2016