expired 06.11.09

## Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: ADC/0360/09** **Recommendation - Permit**

**Site:** **335 Albion Street Southwick Brighton West Sussex**

**Proposal:** **Rear extension**

### The Application

The application property is the eastern end house in a terrace of four, which is located on the north side of the road, within the built up area of Southwick. The house is brick built with a natural pebbledash finish and plain clay tiles.

The dwelling has a rear single-storey mono pitched roof extension, which has been extended to on the east and west side with a conservatory and store room of similar depth, both with a polycarbonate roof and part timber framework part brick elevation. The existing extension is the whole width of the property and is 1.8m in depth, with a roof height of 3.4m.

The proposals are to demolish the existing extensions and erect a single-storey extension of a more permanent construction across the whole rear of the dwelling. The proposed extension would be 9.4m in width, by 3.35m in depth, by 3.6m – 3.4m, in height. The extension would be used for an enlarged kitchen, with the existing kitchen being utilised as a ground floor utility/bathroom.

The attached neighbour to the west (No.333) has a single-storey rear extension, with access from the first floor to utilise the flat-roof as a balcony. The extension is recessed in from the shared boundary with the application site and a gap of approximately 1m is retained. The neighbours extension has a shower room on the east side with a clear window with outlook directly to the 2m high boundary fence. In addition a small bedroom window is retained in the original rear elevation of the dwelling, between the extension and the boundary with the site.

To the east across a shared driveway/access, No.337 is a similar end of terrace house. It has been extended with a two-storey rear extension with cat-slide roof and rear facing large dormer.

### Consultations and Representations

***Third Parties:*** There has been one letter of objection from the owner of No.333, who states that they are concerned about the height and length of the extension. If given permission they feel that natural light will be blocked from their property.

## Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.'
PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

## Planning Assessment

***Policies***
Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general.

Development Control Standard No.3 states that single-storey extensions which either abut or are within a metre of the boundary should be no deeper than 3.5m, to prevent loss of outlook. It also states that where dwellings have been built with projecting sections it would not usually be acceptable to build an extension infilling the space to the boundary, as rooms would be left in a deep recess which would have a poor outlook with insufficient light.

***Residential amenity***
The attached neighbour has two rooms which could be affected by the length and height of the proposals. Their rear bedroom which currently has a window in the recess between their own rear extension and the neighbours existing extension; and the bathroom window in the east side of the extension which currently looks directly toward the boundary.

As originally submitted the proposed extension would have had a roof line that stepped around the west side bedroom window. The maximium height of the roof adjacent to the boundary would have been 3.6m, 0.25m higher that the roof that currently exists. Subsequent to the neighbours comments regarding the additional height of the proposed extension, the applicant has slightly revised the design so that the pitched roof on the west side of the extension maintains a small flat roofed area below the window line towards the boundary, so that the height of the roof would now be no more than currently exists (adjacent to No.333).

With regards to the outlook from the neighbours bathroom. As stated the bathroom window does not have obscured glass, and the outlook is directly towards the 2m high boundary fence. Only when standing directly adjacent to the sink (under the window) in this bathroom, is there any outlook other than of the fence. The inner room of the neighbours extension is a dining room with patio doors to the rear, and whilst if the interconnecting bathroom door was

open, there might be some , very limited, additional sunlight provided to the dining area, it is not considered that this would be greatly affected.

The outlook from the rear bedroom of No.333 is very poor, and the bedroom is dark. The small window that serves it is located on the far east side of the room, within an alcove recess in the room. When standing back from this window any significant distance, the only outlook is of the existing boundary fence. The only place in which an outlook towards the rear garden is possible is standing directly in front of the window, and even then the outlook is severely impeded by the flank wall of the neighbours own extension, and the high boundary fence. Taking into consideration the existing very poor outlook from the bedroom it is not considered that the slight increase in height and depth of the proposals would result in a loss of amenity that would warrant a refusal.

***Visual amenity***

The proposed extension would have similar materials to the face brick of the existing easternmost rear extension, and a tiled roof would match in materials to those on the existing house (albeit a different shape). The size of the proposed extension would not appear particularly cramped or out of keeping, and it is considered that the design of the extension would generally be sympathetic to the appearance of the house and the surrounding area.

**Recommendation**

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPi

1. C1Ci
2. C14Ai (19.10.09, AH7 of the ADLP)
3. C18Eiv (west)

Case Officer: [redacted] PB 19/10
Date: 19-10-09

Planning Services Manager: [redacted]
Date: 19/10/09

Development Control Committee Chairm[redacted]
Date: 19/10/09