Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1911/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 63 Old Barn Way, Southwick, BN42 4NS

Proposal: Single storey front extension and two storey rear extension

Date of site visit: 31.01.2017

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The site is a middle of terrace, two storey property with a small rear garden. The street scene comprises many properties of the same design; however, many have added front porches of differing sizes and designs.

It has a small single storey rear lean-to extension with a crinkly tin roof plus a glasshouse and a shed in the rear garden.

No. 65 has a conservatory rear extension and no.61 has a brick built single storey rear extension

Properties to rear are flat roofed.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the following:- a mono pitch roof, front extension measuring approx. 3.4m wide x 1.5m deep x 3.3m high. The extension is to enlarge a ground floor bedroom; a mono pitch roof ground floor rear extension measuring 6.3m wide x 3m deep x 3.3m high; and a two storey, false pitch roof rear extension measuring 6.2m wide x 2m deep x 5.9m high

Consultations: None

Representations: 1 letter retracting objection

- As the owner of 61 Old Barn Way, I write to retract my previous objection.
- After discussing the proposal I have struck and accord with the regards the proposed planning of this front and rear extension; this accord eliminates all my previous objections
- I would like to give my support to the current plans (477/01 rev B) and the purpose for which they are being carried out for

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7

Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
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 property extensions will enlarge the existing bedrooms; I am informed that the resultant dwelling will accommodate the extended family of three generations.

With regard to the front extension, it will read as a front porch, and indeed, many of the properties within the street and area, have provided a front porch, of styles that are often competing with one another i.e. mono pitch roof; flat roof; sloping roof; hipped roof; rectangular building; square building etc. all within close proximity and including the application site. Although the proposed front extension will not be a porch, it nevertheless will be in accord with the other front extension porches within the area. The application site has a high pitched roof porch, which is shown to be removed when the front extension is constructed. It is considered that it would be reasonable to condition any approval to restrict the construction of any future porches.

The ground floor rear extension, at 3 metres in depth, accords with the general principles of the Development Control Standard No. 3, “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings, advises that rear extensions do not project more than 3.5 metres from the rear wall of the original dwelling. The neighbouring property no. 61 has a single storey brick faced extension up to the boundary with the application site, of the same depth, therefore the proposed ground floor rear extension will not have a negative impact onto its adjoining extension.

The first floor rear extension has been designed to keep the height down, further, it has been indented from the boundary with no. 61 in order to prevent a loss of outlook from the bedroom window at no. 61, no. 63 has a wc window nearest the proposal which is not a habitable room. The first floor extension is also stepped back by approx. 1metre from the ground floor extension, which will create a subservient form of development, which would not unacceptably impact onto the neighbours..

Residential Amenity

As a middle of terrace property, it is reasoned that the scheme proposed should consider its neighbours which are in close proximity, i.e. no.’s 61, and 65. There is also a property (no. 59) which lies directly across the rear of the application site.

The front extension will not result in overshadowing or harm to no. 61, as the closest window at ground floor level relates to a wc and hall; the rear single

storey extension is 3m in depth, which is less than the 3.5 metres for rear extensions as advised within Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'; the first floor rear extension is stepped away from the rear bedroom window of no. 61, thereby preventing any overshadowing onto that property, and is 2m in depth.

The other side of the property is no. 65 Old Barn Way and has slightly differing considerations than no. 61. The front extension will be to the side of no. 63, who have their wc window and hall window next to the extension, which are not habitable rooms and thereby will not be affected by the front extension.

Turning to the rear extension, no. 65 have a glazed conservatory extension to the rear. The proposed two storey extension is split in that the ground floor section is 3 metres deep, whereas the first floor element is 2 metres deep. As discussed above, the 3metre depth for a ground floor extension accords with the Supplementary Planning Guidance Document 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings', it is noted that the conservatory at no. 65 is set away from the boundary by approx. 3metres, which contributes to the minimization of possible overshadowing to the conservatory.

Further, given the orientation of the sun, for a large part of the day, the shadowing that will occur from the sun being to the south will not demonstrably impact onto no. 65, given that the existing building will cast more of a shadow than the proposal which will be contained within the outer boundaries of the property. There would though be some effect when the sun is to the west in the afternoon, but given that the first floor would be only 2 metres in depth, it is not considered that this amount would cause an unacceptable impact onto the conservatory or the general garden area of the property.

The property across the rear of the application sites garden, no. 59 is also a two storey dwelling and lies at right angles to no. 63. Its rear garden directly abuts the rear garden of no. 63. No. 59 has a glazed conservatory to its rear, and the existing distance between the existing extension of no. 63 and the conservatory of no. 59 is some 11.4metres, with the existing extension measuring approx. 2metres. The new proposal would see a 3metre deep ground floor and a 2metre deep first floor. This would then close the gap between the proposal and the conservatory at no. 59 to just over 10 metres.

The existing first floor windows which look towards no. 59 are a bedroom and a bathroom, this would change to 2no. bedrooms. It is not considered that a closer built form at first floor level of 2metres and a change to a bedroom in lieu of the bathroom would result in unacceptable harm onto the rear amenities of no. 59 Further, there will be no additional overshadowing from the two storey extension onto no. 59, given that the extension is contained within the existing envelope of the main dwelling.

The extension which is located wholly at the rear, would have no impact on the street-scene

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to the following conditions

1. Approved plans
2. Standard time limit
3. Materials to be as per approved plan
4. No windows in any of the side elevations without prior permission of LPA

Informative Approved following amendments

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

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 21.02.2017

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 2 March 2017