Expiry Date – 3/7

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0695/18 Recommendation – Grant

Site: 35 Phoenix Way, Southwick

Proposal: Single storey rear extension to north east elevation of flat.

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 6.6

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a ground floor flat in a semi detached property on the north east side of Phoenix Way close to the end of the bell mouth. These are brick built inter war properties with the appearance of typical bay fronted semi detached houses. The properties have half width single storey rear additions on their outside walls.

The property is not in a conservation area and is not listed.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought to square off the rear addition infilling up to the boundary. The extension measures 2 metres in depth and has a flat roof with an external height of 2.6 metres.

Relevant Planning History

None.

Consultations

None undertaken.

Representations

One objection received from No. 36:

I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and know the site well, being the owner of the ground floor flat adjoining the ground floor property to which the extension is proposed. I wish to object to the proposed extension.

Our joint properties form the ground floor of a building which has projecting sections to the rear on each side with a recess in the middle, as demonstrated on the planning permission application documents: Site location plan and block plan.

Adur District Council Development Management Standard No. 2 – Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings, Section 3.3 states "Where dwellings have been built with projecting sections it would not usually be acceptable to build an extension infilling the space between the projection and the boundary with an attached property, unless both property owners co-operate to build a combined extension. This is because the property which was not extended would be left with rooms in a deep recess which would have poor outlook and insufficient light".

The plans for the rear extension do indeed intend to infill the section between one of the projections and the shared boundary, therefore the above development management standard has not been met in the submitted plans.

If the extension were to be built, and the section between projection and boundary infilled, there would be a resulting loss of natural light to a habitable area in my property – the only bedroom. The extension would cause a recess to be formed, leaving the bedroom to become colder and darker that at present. The middle of the closest bedroom window to the boundary is less than one meter away. This is particularly important when taking into account the north-east elevation of the rear of the property, and the orientation of the proposed extension (with my property being located almost to the west). Light is limited in a north-east elevation due to the natural path of the sun, and the extension would block this further due to its orientation, especially during winter when the sun is low in the sky.

Section 2.1 (Planning Principles) of the Development Management Standard No 2 states that "In considering an application for an extension to a house or bungalow one of the main planning concerns is to ensure that the proposal will not have an adverse effect on neighbouring properties", with Section 2.2 stating "Daylight – any proposal should not reduce the daylight to neighbouring properties to an unacceptable extent". As explained above, the proposed extension does indeed have an adverse effect on my property in relation to daylight due to the recess, north-east elevation and orientation of the extension in relation to my property.

In summary, even though the proposed plans are only for a small, single-storey extension, they do not meet Adur Distinct Councils Management Development Standard No 2. Section 3.3 as it would infill a space between a projection and a boundary, leaving a recess. This would then have an adverse effect to the natural light reaching a habitable area, in this case the only bedroom in a ground floor flat, especially when the north-easterly elevation and orientation of the extension in relation to my property are taken into account (Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the Management Development Standard No. 2).

I would very much appreciate if the Council would take my objections into consideration when deciding the application. I would also be very happy to provide full access to the rear of my property for a site visit to be carried out, and to discuss the above objections with a representative from the planning department.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012
Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and 15 including 'Development Management Standard No. 2 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development can be supported as it upgrades a dwelling within the built up area boundary. For consideration is the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area and the impacts of the development on neighbour amenity.

Neighbour amenity

The extension will build up to the boundary. The adjoining flat (36) has a single storey rear extension off the shared boundary, as at the site. The rear bedroom at 36 will be left in a recess.

Para 3.3 of adopted Development Management Standard No. 2 states:

3.3 Where dwellings have been built with projecting sections it would not usually be acceptable to build an extension infilling the space between the projection and the boundary with an attached dwelling, unless both property owners co-operate to build a combined extension. This is because the property which was not extended would be left with rooms in a deep recess which would have a poor outlook and insufficient light.

The proposed extension is only 2 metres deep and is only 2.6 metres high. It is not considered that an extension of this depth will leave the bedroom at No. 36 in a 'deep recess.' It is also considered that sufficient daylight will continue to be received to this bedroom as it has windows across most of its width, including the upper panes of French doors. Consequently, it is not considered that the extension is in breach of policy 15 of the local plan nor of DM standard No. 2.

Character

The extension will not be visible in the street and is typical of domestic rear extensions.

Recommendation APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved Plans
2. 3 years
3. Materials to match
4. No side windows

Informative

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 any representations? Yes

Case Officer signed: MOK Date: 21/6/18

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 21 June 2018