~~22/5/08~~
Expiry
16/6/08

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0217/08 **Recommendation – Permit Application**

Site: **40 The Gardens Southwick Brighton West Sussex**

Proposal: **First floor extension to side over existing single storey extension (Reg 3)**

The Application

The site is located within the built up area of Southwick. A semi detached property within a street of similar style semi detached and terraced properties. The property has an existing side, single storey flat roof addition which there are similar examples of at adjacent properties.

Permission is sought to erect a first floor extension above the existing flat roof addition, 2 metres wide, 3.8 metres deep with a maximum height of 7 metres, slightly lower than the existing ridge height at 7.2 metres. The extension will provide a bathroom at first floor level, a window is proposed on the side of the extension.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: - No third party objections have been received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005) (saved policies): LOC1, DEV1
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'
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies

Structure Plan policies seek to protect, and where possible, enhance the character and distinctiveness of an area, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1).

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.

Residential Amenity

The main property to be affected is no. 42 The Gardens, to the east of the site. The extension will bring the first floor of the building closer to this neighbouring property. At the side elevation of this property there is a ground floor secondary window and door and at first floor there are two windows which appear to be secondary windows and/or windows which do not serve habitable rooms. There will be some loss of light to the first floor side window as a result of the extension however it is not considered that the impact is such to warrant a refusal in this case as these windows are not providing the primary light source to habitable room. With regards to loss of privacy, the proposed side window will be fitted with obscured glazing to avoid any over looking.

Visual Amenity

The proposed extension will be clearly visible within the street scene. However it is considered that the design and scale of the extension is in keeping with the existing building and street scene. There is an example of a similar extension in close proximity to the site at no. 12 The Gardens, SW/32/01/TP. This extension is also a first floor addition above an existing ground floor flat roof addition. This extension is lower than the proposal and narrower as a result of the existing ground floor addition being smaller than that existing at no. 40. It was considered that this scale and design was more appropriate and the applicant has looked into ways in which the current scheme could replicate this existing extension. Due to the existing ground floor extension at no. 40 being larger than that at no. 12 the first floor addition is therefore larger and also the roof pitch is higher. The scale and height of the first floor extension could be reduced however this would result in either a rebuild of the ground floor section of the building, which is not a viable option, or to leave a proportion of the flat roof and only build partially at first floor level. It is considered the second option would result in awkward design and the proposal is considered to be the favoured option in this case, despite the height and bulk of the extension being greater than that at no 12. The applicant has also stated the need for a accessible WC and disabled shower facility and a reduction in size would not allow for the required space. On balance it is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable and will not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the street scene or existing building.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :- 1PPi

1. C1Ci
2. C12Ei
3. C18C3- eastern

Case Officer..... Baker .....Date..22/5/08.

PS 23/5/08