Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1182/17 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 61 Old Barn Way, Southwick, Brighton

Proposal: First floor side extension to west elevation above existing garage.

Date of site visit: 22.08.17

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposal

The application relates to a two storey end of terrace dwelling with a single garage to the side. There is a porch to the front and off street parking. Old Barn Way runs to the front of the site and also along the side of the existing garage. There is a close boarded fence abutting the pavement to the side.

Consent is sought to retain the existing side garage extension and build a first floor addition above the same footprint as existing. The plans show it to provide a master bedroom with ensuite. The ridge height will be lower than the main ridge and the width of the extension less so than the main house, following the footprint of the existing garage.

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
Adur Submission Local Plan Policy 17 (2016)
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 first floor addition is highly prominent being on a corner plot, adjacent to the highway to the front and side. It is also close to the road to the front with an open frontage.

The side garage addition is prominent as existing and is not considered to be overly sympathetic with its roof form or detailing. The white garage door is not

centrally positioned. The additional floor will add to the prominence of the building being clearly visible and much higher and bulkier yet. It will allow for the awkward part hipped roof to be removed which would allow for a first floor gable roof in keeping with the existing design of the building and row of terraces. The roof design being lower than the main ridge and shallower than the main side gable will allow for a subservient form of development.

To the west of the other side of the road to the side is a similar two storey additions. Materials however differ here as this extension replicates the brick pillars and use of render combined with brick which is integral to the original building design. Ideally any addition at the site address should replicate such design and use of materials. As the ground floor garage structure is to be retained such a design and finish is regrettably not possible here. The brick pillars cannot be replicated and the garage door is not centrally positioned. Therefore the first floor window must be replicated as such. Amended plans were requested to show the first floor window centrally positioned above the garage door so there is some relative positioning here. Although not ideal and the design here could be improved significantly if the extension was being built as a whole there would not be justification to refuse the scheme in this case. The visual harm is not significantly to the detriment of the character and appearance of the existing dwelling house or the surrounding area. A condition is attached to restrict any openings on the side wall of the extension.

Residential Amenity

The proposed extension will not impact detrimentally upon the residential amenities of any adjacent neighbouring properties. It is adjacent to the highway with the road to the front. To the rear is the garden of the host dwelling with the side of the property frontage of the neighbouring dwelling to the rear (north). Although the extension is visible within the surrounding area it will not result in any direct loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. Standard time limit
2. Materials to match
3. Approved plans
4. No opening on the western side wall of the extension.

Informative

1. proactive – with amendments

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 25.09.17

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 25.09.2017