# DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

Application No: AWDM/0966/11

Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 51 The Gardens Southwick Brighton West Sussex

Proposal: Part single/part 2-storey rear extension

**NEIGHBOURS CHECKED:** Y

**ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS:** N

**PROPOSAL, SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:**

The application property comprises an end of terrace house located on the north side of The Gardens. It has been enlarged by a rear 'lean-to' conservatory. Beyond the conservatory is a timber-framed 'pergola' with rush matting that can be rolled out over the roof (in order to provide privacy to a hot tub in the rear garden).

The surrounding area is made up of short blocks of terraced houses and semi-detached pairs. These houses on the north side, backing onto the railway embankment, are unusual in that the very long rear gardens are bisected by a rear service road.

Permission is sought to remove the conservatory and replace it with a part single-storey part 2-storey rear extension. The proposed extension would be 3.5m deep. The single-storey element closest to the common boundary with the attached house No.49 would have a flat roof 2.8m high. An annotation on the drawing states that the fascia would be contained within the cartilage of the application site. The proposed 2-storey extension would have a hipped and pitched roof with a ridge 6.9m high. There would be a distance of 2m between the western flank wall of the proposed 2-storey element of the extension and the common boundary.

**RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY** None.

**RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES**

Saved Adur District Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
South East Plan: CC1, CC6, BE1

**RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES** None

**REPRESENTATIONS:** None

**PLANNING ASSESSMENT:**

The proposal comprises up-grading 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 design of the extension and effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

The most affected property is No.49, a mid-terraced house to the west. The proposed single-storey extension would have some impact on daylighting to, and the outlook from, the French doors in the rear elevation of No.49, which serve a dining area. This north-facing room is already relatively dark. However, the outlook from this room is partially obstructed by a timber shed in the rear garden (of No.49), sited approximately 2 metres from the French doors. The shed also has an effect on the receipt of daylight. The depth of the proposed single-storey extension complies with the Council's DC Standard No.3, and although it would have some impact on the amenities of No.49 the effect would not be so severe as to warrant refusal.

The above mentioned Standard states that 2-storey or first-floor rear extensions which abut or are within 1m of a side boundary with an attached dwelling, should normally be no deeper than 2m, and that extensions abutting the boundary will not normally be permitted.

As originally submitted it was considered that the height and 'bulk' of the proposed 2-storey element of the extension would have an enclosing effect on the rear outlook of No.49. It was suggested that the applicant either reduce the depth of the extension or increase the separation distance to the common boundary in order to relieve the impact on the amenities of No.49. This suggestion was not acceptable to the applicant because it would result in a reduction in floor space within the proposed bedroom. As an alternative, **an amended drawing has been submitted lowering the eaves and ridge height of the proposed extension by 300mm**. The severity of the impact on the outlook and daylight of No.49 would be slightly relieved by the amendment, such that it is considered refusal would not be warranted.

As originally submitted there would be a first-floor window (1.15m wide) in the west side of the proposed extension. The window was shown as obscurely glazed with a fanlight opener. The proposed room would also be served by a (clear-glazed) window in the north elevation. Notwithstanding the obscured glazing, it was considered that the introduction of a window within 2m of the boundary would give rise to a perception of overlooking (particularly at night with lights on). It was suggested that the window be omitted. However, this was not acceptable to the applicant who wishes to benefit from late afternoon sunshine. As a compromise, **the amended drawing shows the window reduced in width to 0.7m and re-positioned slightly further northwards in the west elevation.** Subject to a condition requiring the window to be obscured glazed and restricted to a fanlight opener only, it is considered refusal would not be warranted on grounds of an increased perception of overlooking.

No.53 comprises an end of terrace to the east and is separated from No.51 by the width of a shared access drive (which serves the rear of these terraced blocks). No.53 is sited slightly further to the north of No.51 and at an angle. There are no windows in the flank elevation. There would be little or no impact on the amenities of this property.

Design and the effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The hipped and pitched roof of the first-floor element of the extension would be subservient in appearance to the existing house (which has a part-gabled roof form). The perception of subservience would be further reinforced by the amendment, lowering the eaves height in relation to the main dwelling. Glimpsed views of the extension may be visible from the street, but it would not be a prominent or unsightly addition to the street scene. The flat roof of the single-storey is considered satisfactory on this smaller scale element.

**RECOMMENDATION** APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and subject to the conditions of this planning permission 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 (AH7, AG1), or the policies of the South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1).

SUBJECT TO:-

1. Standard time limit (3 yrs)
2. Approved drawings
3. Matching materials
4. First-floor window in west side to be obscured with fanlight opener
5. No additional windows in side walls of rear extension(s).

Informative: No part of extension to encroach the boundary.

**IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?**

No

**Delegated Decision**

Case Officer
Sign Jo Morin Date 17 Jan 2012

Authorising Officer
Sign Keith Morgan Date 18 January 2012