Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – Approve**
AWDM/1014/15

Site: **48 Southwick Street, Southwick**

Proposal: **Single storey extension to south side elevation to replace existing garage.**

Date of site visit: 18 August 2015

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site comprises a semi-detached two storey house located on the east side of Southwick Street, south of its junction with Manor Hall Road. The house has an existing lean-to garage/car port structure attached to its side wall and immediately adjacent to the boundary with No.46 to the south. No.48 has also been extended at the rear with a modest lean-to single storey addition and a conservatory extending beyond that on the northern side of the rear elevation.

This is a predominantly residential area comprising of a mix of dwelling types and designs, although in this part of the street on the east side the site is one of several matching semi detached houses.

Permission is sought for a single storey extension to the south elevation, replacing the existing garage structure. The extension would align with the front wall of the house and extend to align with the rear wall of the existing single storey addition (2.2 metres beyond the original rear wall and 10.65 metres in depth in total). The extension would have a hipped roof up to 3.2 metres in height and with an eaves level of 2.4 metres approximately.

Relevant site history

None relevant

Consultations

West Sussex County Council: The ***Archaeologist*** advises that the northern property boundary of 48 Southwick Street is about ten metres south of the boundary of the southern area of the scheduled monument Southwick Roman villa. In 2011 geophysical survey and limited trial archaeological investigation demonstrated that structural remains of Roman date (wall and floor surface) survived in the north west corner of Eastbrook Primary School playing field (within 40 metres of the application address). Although the proposed single storey extension is a modest proposal and normally de minimis, there is the potential to disturb and destroy remains of Roman date associated with

Southwick villa. He recommends that to mitigate the impact of the proposal (and avoid the need for archaeological monitoring and recording) the extension should sit on a rafted concrete foundation rather than using conventional strip foundations. If the Adur Worthing building control adviser insists on conventional metre deep strip foundations then provision for archaeological monitoring and recording will be required subject to a planning condition in line with the NPPF.

Representations
None received

Planning Assessment

Visual amenity

There are other examples in the streetscene of single storey garages built up to align with the main front wall of the house as at the application site. Although there is no setback proposed, it would replace the existing lean-to garage of the same alignment and designed with a hipped roof it would appear as a reasonably subservient addition to the building and would not have any significant impact on the character of the street given the presence of other similar additions.

Residential amenity
The extension would be well separated from the adjoining house at No. 50. The main impact would be to the occupiers No.46 to the south.

No.46 has an enclosed car port structure to the side wall and has been extended to the rear with a single storey addition which has a high parapet wall on its north side facing the application site. There is the original kitchen side window in the original side wall facing the application site which appears to be serving an area open to the extended kitchen according to the original application drawings and so would not be the main window, with the main outlook being to the rear for the extended kitchen. There is also a small side window in the original side wall which appears to serve a bathroom. Having regard to permitted development fallback which would allow a single storey side extension (not extending beyond the original rear wall) with an eaves height of up to 3 metres and that using the BRE's 25 degree rule of thumb for the neighbours facing window the proposed extension would not extend beyond that line, it is considered that despite the additional depth beyond the original rear wall the impact on light and outlook would not be so harmful to warrant refusal of the application given the relatively low eaves and ridge height proposed.

A condition is recommended to prevent any further side windows without permission in the interests of protecting privacy.

Recommendation

Approve
Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit 3 years

2. The extension shall be constructed to sit on a rafted concrete foundation rather than using conventional strip foundations. If it is not possible for the extension to be constructed in this manner, then no development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological works in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Local Planning Authority. A written record of any archaeological works undertaken shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority within 3 months of the completion of any archaeological investigation unless an alternative timescale for submission of the report is first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
3. Matching tiles and matching brickwork to front elevation, painted render to side and rear elevations.
4. No further side windows
5. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Drawing number 521 (PL)2a entitled 'Site Plan' deposited 2 July 2015
   Drawing number 521 (PL)1a entitled 'Side Extension Proposal' deposited 2 July 2015

Informative:

1. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.
   .

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

Case Officer: Rebekah Smith Date: 29 September 2015

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 30 September 2015