Expiry Date - 03-02-2015

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/1790/15**

Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: **55 The Crescent Southwick Brighton**

Proposal: **Single-storey rear extension to be used as granny annexe elderly relative**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: /N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a single storey rear extension to measure (at max) 3.1 metres in height, 6.5 metres in length, and 4.5 metres in width.

The application property is an inter-war semi-detached two-storey dwellinghouse. The surrounding area is residential in its character.

Relevant Planning History
None

Consultations
None

Representations (summarised)
Objection from occupier of 53 The Crescent: *Strong objection. Taking account of extremity of height and length directly adjacent to boundary of my property would affect my enjoyment of my property due to impact on light and outlook. Size, design and location would result in extension which would be dominated and overbearing, creating unacceptable sense of enclosure to my house; a feeling of being hemmed in. Light would be blocked out to right hand side ground floor of my property due to height of proposed extension. Light would be blocked out to a large area of my garden due to length and height of proposed extension. Difference in Land Levels of Properties no. 53 and 55. Difference in land levels of two properties would further increase the dominant, overshadowing and claustrophobic issues mentioned above. The Crescent is a road which is clearly visible uphill slope which runs upwards from Manor Hall Road to Hadrian Avenue. No. 55 is on a higher ground level than my property, as can easily be viewed from both front and rear of both. Request changes in levels between two properties and gardens are taken into account. Looking out onto my garden, it rises to its highest line, length wise, along the far right where the boundary is to 55. Boundary To best of my knowledge, I understand extensions within one metre of the boundary will*

normally be limited to a maximum of 3.5 metres in length, and for every additional metre from the boundary this can be increased by one metre. Bearing this in mind, along with my above issues, I request that an extension of a more reasonable distance from my boundary. Boundary wall There is a boundary wall of 6ft long joined onto the rear of my neighbour's property. I can see no mention of this wall on the extension application. This wall requires attention prior to any extension being built in front of it, whilst there is still easy access to repair or replace it, prior to it becoming unsafe. It is currently cracked and leaning slightly. Trees It states on the application form that coniferous trees marked T3 at no. 55 are well pruned and not within falling distance to extension. I think this should be clarified by a third party as in my opinion they appear to have grown into very dense, tall and unshaped conifers. All seven trees appear to be of a similar height, being the same height as the top of No. 55's chimney. Hence, why I believe the falling distance needs clarifying. Location Plan and Block Plan Block and Location plans submitted are pre extension plans. I understand you do have more recent plans and an aerial view to hand showing my back right hand ground floor window and windowed door.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework: Para 14
Saved Adur Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle. The accommodation would be ancillary to the main house.

Visual amenity

> The scale of the extension is sympathetically domestic in relation to the host dwelling. Its flat roof would reduce its bulk and mass. Its exterior materials and finishes would match existing. The windows would be similar to the fenestration on the main house.

Residential amenity – effect on existing dwellings

It is the neighbour to the west side who is principally impacted upon by this development (which is physically removed from the remainder).

Neighbour to the west

The extension length protrudes for 6.6m into the rear garden, close to the shared boundary with the neighbour.

However its design has been amended to a flat roof which reduces the proportion of built form that would protrude above the shared boundary fence (irrespective of the very marginal level changes between the site and neighbour's land). The extension is angled slightly off from the boundary. The outlook and light received by the neighbour's nearest

habitable room window to the shared boundary (a kitchen) is already compromised by the existing two-storey extension at No.55. No windows are proposed in the flank of the extension facing the shared boundary.

In such circumstance, the proposal would not adversely overbear or overshadow, and there would be no adverse overlooking/loss of privacy.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Accommodation to be ancillary
4. Materials and finishes to match
5. No windows/openings in extension flank

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 12-2-16

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 15 February 2016