Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0243/13 Recommendation – Approve

Site: 33 Greenways, Southwick, Brighton

Proposal: Single storey rear and side extension

Date of site visit: 9th April 2013 and 1st May 2013

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a detached bungalow within a street of similar in the built up area of Southwick. It is a corner plot at the top of Greenways on the west side of the street. East bank runs to the north of the bungalow. The bungalow is at a higher level than the bungalows to the south with the street level to the north, (East bank) being a higher level also.

Permission is sought for a side and rear single storey extension. The side extension is on the north side and is set back from the front of the property by 5 metres. The side extension is 2.1 metres wide and continues into a wrap around extension to the rear. The rear extension extends by 3.4 metres and is the full width of the rear elevation of the bungalow plus the 2.1 metres of the side extension. The extension has a dummy pitch roof up to a maximum height of 3.5 metres. There are two large roof lights proposed over the rear extension these slight protrude above the dummy pitch taking the maximum height up to 3.65 metres.

Representations: No third party representations have been received.

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’
South East Plan (GOSE 2009): CC1, CC6, BE1
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading of the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

The proposed side and rear extensions will be visible within the street scene however the impact is restricted due to the change in levels with the bungalow being set down slightly below the street level. There is also some vegetation along the side and rear boundary of the bungalow which also contribute to the extension appearing subservient and reducing its dominance within the street scene. There is also a boundary fence along part of the side boundary and the rear boundary.

On balance the extension is considered to be acceptable. The applicant's agent has submitted a sectional drawing to show the bungalow, extension and boundary treatment in relation to the pavement and street level. The roof of the extension will be visible however it is not overly dominant when viewed within the street scene. Due to the set back of the extension it is not prominent when viewed from the front of the bungalow. An amended plan has been sought which shows the existing side window on the north elevation, which abuts the extension, to be reduced in width to improve the relationship between this window and the proposed extension. The amended plans are satisfactory in improving this elevation.

Residential amenity

It is not considered that the extension has any impact on the adjacent bungalows. No. 31 is to the south and the rear extension will be adjacent to the boundary with this neighbouring dwelling. However there is spacing of 1.5 metres between the extension and the adjacent bungalow. As existing there is a dense Leylandii hedge along the side boundary between these bungalows. These trees will be removed prior to construction of the extension. No. 31 is on lower ground level and there is a rear conservatory set away from the boundary and a window serving a habitable room adjacent to the boundary. Despite the change in levels the extension is positioned to the north and will therefore not result in a significant overshadowing to the adjacent dwelling. It is considered the impact on daylight would be little different to the existing situation given the siting of the Leylandii hedge (approximately at eaves height) which currently forms a dense screen overhanging the boundary. The extension will be set in from the boundary and it is not considered that it will result in an overbearing impact on the occupiers of the adjacent bungalow.

In addition it should be noted that the Council's Development Control Standards state that a single storey extension up to 3.5 metres can be constructed adjacent to the boundary of a semi detached or terraced dwelling. In this case the extension is 3.4 metres in depth and there is a slight gap of 1.5 metres between the bungalows. This relationship is therefore considered to be acceptable in this case.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7)

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Materials to match existing dwelling
3. Approved plans
4. No additional/larger openings on s. side
5. The rooflights hereby permitted shall not protrude above the proposed roof in excess of that shown on the approved drawing 'Proposed Details Revision (a) received 18th April 2013.

Informatives: -

1. Precautionary land contamination

If during development, any visible contaminated or odorous material, (for example asbestos containing material, stained soil, petrol/diesel/solvent odour, underground tanks or associated pipework) not previously identified, is found to be present at the site, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until it has been investigated by the developer. The Local Planning Authority must be informed immediately of the nature and degree of the contamination present and a method statement detailing how the unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with must be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing before being implemented.

2. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, 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: Hannah Barker Date: 1st May 2013

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 2 May 2013