expires 27.02.08

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0002/08 **Recommendation - Refuse**

Site: **41 Hill Farm Way Southwick Brighton West Sussex**

Proposal: **Side extension (including garage with room above)**

The Application

The application property is the eastern half of a pair of semi-detached bungalows located on the northern side of Hill Farm Way within the built up area of Southwick. The proposal is to demolish the existing east side detached garage, and replace it with side extension including a garage with rooms in the roof including front dormer and rear dormer extension.

The surrounding area is characterised by semi-detached bungalows of a similar age and design, many of which have front flat-roof dormers. To the east (No's 43 – 61) are 10 pairs of semi-detached bungalows which are gable ended and built more recently. The attached property (No.39) has not been extended and sits on a lower ground level. To the east there is a gap of 12m between the application property and its neighbour (No.43). An odd relation ship exists between the sites of No's 41 & 43 where the boundary between flares out towards the highway, giving the front of No.41 a much narrower frontage that that of No.43.

The existing dwelling has previously been extended with a rear single-storey extension and attached rear conservatory, both built under permitted development, and rooms in the roof with a hip to gable extension with front and rear dormers.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: There has been one letter of objection on behalf of the owner of the neighbouring property (No.43). They raise concerns that the bulk and mass of the extension being located so close to her property will result in loss of privacy and daylight and will lead to overlooking. They feel that the design is rather ugly and could affect the enjoyment of her property and its value.

They are also concerned that the excavation of the sloping site could affect the existing retaining wall and her bungalow. ***[The issues of value and the retaining wall are civil matters not covered by planning control]***

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (WSCC 2005): LOC1, DEV1, DEV4-5.
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7, and Appendix II ' Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

Planning Assessment

Policies

Structure Plan policies seek to protect and, where possible enhance the character and distinctiveness of areas, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). Policy AH7 of the Local Plan, relation specifically to extensions and alterations to dwellings, states that they should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable loss of light or privacy or have an overbearing effect on the neighbouring dwelling and be sympathetic to the original dwelling. Supplementary Planning Guidance in DC Standard No. 3 'Extension and Alteration to Dwellings' states that the most important basic principle is that any extension should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and street scene generally. In particular, the proposal should not be allowed to over-dominate the house or clash with its appearance.

Residential amenity

The proposed side extension would not have any windows in the side elevation and would therefore not impact the privacy of the adjacent bungalow (No.43). There would still be a gap of 1.0m to the side boundary with No.43, however due to the angle of the boundary between the sites there would be a gap of 6.0m between the flank wall of the extension and the west side neighbouring property.

The site boundary is made up of a hedge approximately 5m high which has been partially removed at the front of the property. The hedge would need to be removed along the boundary between No's 41 & 43 to enable the erection of the side extension, however it is considered that the affect on outlook and amount of light available would be no worse than currently exists.

Visual amenity

The property has previously been extended with a hip to gable roof extension permitted under planning approval SW/81/92, in which the matter of the unbalancing of the pair of semi-detached properties was considered to be acceptable. Under the current planning application the proposed side extension would retain this gable end, but given the width of the proposal it is felt that the impact would be considerably greater, and would therefore result in an overbalancing of the property, resulting in a over dominant side extension.

The proposed side extension would be 6.0m in width whereas the existing property is only 8.0m. The extension would visually nearly double the width of the property. The proposed extension would not appear subservient to the existing structure and again would have an adverse impact on the character of the pair of semi-detached bungalows and on the street scene.

The rear dormer as existing is very dominant and abuts into the side gable making up part of this wall without any retention of tiling to the side. The existing dormer has not been built in accordance with the approved plan SW/81/92/TP and it is unlikely that it would have been approved in this form after the adoption of the above Development Control Standard in 1996, which states that dormers should not be so large that they over dominate the dwelling, resulting in a top heavy 'box-like' appearance, and that a large amount of the original roof should still be clearly visible. The proposed extension of the dormer would be across the whole of the rear roof slope of the extension, and would also abut into the gable end, again leaving no roof tiling to the side, contrary to the above Control Standards.

The proposed front dormer would match the existing front dormer and would not adversely affect the character of the street or that of the existing property.

Recommendation

REFUSE for reason that :-

B5BR
The proposed extension, by reason of its large size and unsympathetic design, would be out of keeping in scale and appearance with the existing bungalows and would detract to an unacceptable extent from the visual amenities and residential environment of the locality and thereby conflict with the policies of the West Sussex Structure Plan (CH1, DEV1) and the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7).

BB 8/2/08

Case Officer: [signature]
Date: 08-02-08