Expires
14.09.09

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0273/09 Recommendation - Permit

Site: **35 Downland Avenue Southwick Brighton West Sussex**

Proposal: **Single storey rear extension to replace existing extension. (Existing garage demolished and new garage and vehicular access constructed as 'permitted development')**

The Application

The application property is the western half of a pair of semi-detached houses located on the north side of the road, directly adjacent to the east of the junction with Kings Road. The house is of brick and tile construction and sited on ground which rises going northwards, with the bungalow to the rear (No.2 Kings road) being on a higher level.

The application house currently has a rear extension which is part flat-roofed and part glazed conservatory, and a detached rear garage located 2.6m further to the rear.

Permission is sought for the demolition of the rear extensions and the erection of a larger rear extension that would serve as a playroom. The proposed extension would be (as amended) 5.9m wide, by 3.5m – 4.3m deep, by 3.2m in height to the top of the false-pitched roof. The existing garage is proposed to be demolished and re-erected to the rear of the garden in an operation that would be permitted development.

The attached dwelling has an extension with part tiled roof across the whole rear of the dwelling, which is 3.4m in depth.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: There have been no third party objections to the proposals.

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 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' states that it would not usually be acceptable for extensions to leave neighbouring properties within deep recesses due to extensions up to the boundary. It goes on to state that single-storey extensions which abut or are within 1m of the boundary should normally be no deeper than 3.5m, to prevent loss of daylight and outlook, and that where extensions are not clearly visible from the road a flat roof is usually acceptable.

Visual amenity
The proposed extension would be 1.7m in depth larger than the current combination of flat-roof extension and conservatory, however it would still span the whole width of the house. Due to the corner location and the sloping site concern was raised regarding the prominence of the proposed flat roof of the extension as originally submitted. The applicant has submitted amended plans which show a false pitched roof running on the west and north side of the extension which would be more sympathetic to the design of the original house, and would not be out of character for the surrounding area.

Slight amendments have been made to the positioning of the west side windows which now would appear less cramped that originally proposed.

The applicant proposes to stop using the existing vehicular access and reintroduce an access to the rear of the garden (north), where the proposed new permitted development garage would be erected. A 1.7m high boundary fence/brick wall would be reinstated at this point, which would match the current boundary treatment along the west side of the dwelling.

Residential amenity
The proposed extension would project past the rear of the existing extension of the attached house by only 0.8m. It is considered that this would not result in there being an overbearing effect, or result in loss of outlook or loss of natural daylight.

The bungalow directly to the rear is sited 13.5m from the end of the proposed extension, and whilst the above Development Control Standard states that the minimum distance required between the rear of an extension and the side of another dwelling is 14m, an attached garage exists between the side of No.2 Kings Road and the site boundary that would prevent any loss of privacy in this case.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPi

1. C1Ci
2. C14Aii – 01.09.09 (AH7)
3. C12Eii

Case Officer: [redacted]
Date: 08-09-09

PB 9/9/09