Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number:
AWDM/1518/12

Recommendation –
Approve

Site: **28 Hadrian Avenue, Southwick**

Proposal: **Proposed single storey rear extension**

Date of site visit: 17th December 2013

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal site is a semi-detached bungalow on the west side of Hadrian Avenue, within a residential area. The adjoining bungalow, No 30 Hadrian Avenue sits to the south of the application site on slightly lower ground and at a 45 degree angle, facing the boundary fence with No.28. No.26 to the north has been extended substantially at the rear, with a full width dormer and a single storey addition (approx 4 m deep).

The original rear elevation of No.28 extends just under a metre further out at the southern end (where a kitchen is accommodated) than the remaining rear elevation. A small lean-to is attached to the kitchen. There is also a 2.5m deep single storey conservatory.

The 16m deep garden is bounded by 1.8m close boarded fencing, with a low brick wall with fencing behind on the northern boundary.

Revised plans have been received. The original submission was for a flat roof single storey rear extension extending the full width of the property, 0.9 m from the boundary of No.30 Hadrian Avenue.

Following negotiation with the applicant, the proposal has been revised to reduce the impact on No.30. The proposed extension would be set in slightly over 1 m from the boundary, extending 3.4 m to the rear from the rear elevation of the existing kitchen (nearest to the boundary with No.30) and would have a part flat part pitched roof, having a height of 3.4m and 'lining through' with the eaves of the existing bungalow. The proposed materials would match the existing.

Relevant site history

There is no relevant planning history.

Consultations

Environmental Protection: Recommend potentially contaminated land precautionary condition.

Representations

The occupier of No. 30 has objected and made the following points:

- Height of the southern wall would overshadow and dominate no.30
- Restriction of light to habitable rooms, garden area.
- Would have preferred to see the extension set further back and stepped down to the southern corner.
- The applicant has stated that the problems can be overcome by a mansard roof type and these are usually used for two storey extensions and would not be in keeping with the area.
- The overall shape has not changed from the rejected plan dimensions.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
South East Plan (GOSE 2009): CC1, CC6, BE1
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposed works would result in upgrading of the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the impact on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings. The proposed extension would extend to the rear by less than 3.5m (in part), at the point where it would have the most impact (adjacent to the boundary of No.30), in accordance with the SPG.

Visual/residential amenity

The simple design of the proposed addition and use of matching materials would be acceptable in the context of the parent building.

The main properties impacted upon would be No.26 and No.30 Hadrian Avenue. The proposed extension would be visible above the boundary fence of No.30 Hadrian Avenue. In comparison to the original submission which had a flat roof and was closer to the boundary, the part pitch part flat roof would appear less oppressive. Although the proposed extension would have some enclosing effect on the rear of No.30, which has been enlarged by a modest sized glazed lean-to, it would not be overbearing.

The depth, bulk and orientaition of the proposed extension would not result in undue overshadowing and provided the window in the south elevation is of obscured glass there would be no privacy issues. The occupier of No.30 has objected and visited the case officer at the Council. An explanation of the

plans, which were perhaps not fully understood, did not fully allay his concerns. It was pointed out by the case officer that it was considered the proposed roof profile which allows for the eaves to 'line through' with the existing bungalow, would have less impact than the original flat-roofed proposal. The alternative of stepping-down part of the extension closest to the boundary would, in practice, appear awkward in design terms.

On balance, the impact on No.30 is deemed to be acceptable

The impact on the dwelling to the north (no.26) would be negligible, given the position and scale of the addition to No.26.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) or the policies of the South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1)

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Materials to match existing dwelling etc
3. Window in south elevation to be obscured glass.
4. No additional windows in side walls
5. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Drawing No: 12/08/-01 A received 18th February 2013.

Informative

Potentially contaminated land precautionary

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation?

Yes

Case Officer: Jo Sanderson Date: 20th March 2013

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 21 March 2013