Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1564/16 Recommendation – Approve

Site: 38 Southwick Street, Southwick

Proposal: Demolition of existing attached garage and rear extension and construction of single storey side and rear extensions.

Date of site visit: 4 November 2016

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a semi-detached dwelling on the east side of Southwick Street, just outside of the Conservation Area. It is proposed to demolish an existing flat-roofed garage at the side of the building and a single storey pitched roof extension at the rear and to construct a side and rear single storey 'wraparound' extension. It will measure 2.5m wide at the front and will project 4.6m at the rear. The rear extension will be 2.87m from the southern boundary and there will be a gap of 1m to the northern boundary. The extension will have a shallow pitched roof and is to be finished in painted render.

Relevant site history

ADC/0024/07 – Conversion of 2 flats to a single dwelling

Consultations

West Sussex County Council – The Archaeologist has no objection subject to low-level archaeological mitigation measures

Representations

None received

Relevant Planning Policies

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' National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are

the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

The extension is a modest scale relative to the depth of the rear garden plot and it will not harm the character or appearance of the dwelling.

It has only a marginal set back of 75mm at the front. However, there are other examples of side extensions with little or no setback in the street; the extension is considered to be suitably subservient and it will not have a harmful impact on the street scene.

Residential amenity

While deeper than the 3.5m specified in the Council's SPG, it will be no deeper than the existing rear extension. It will also be slightly further from the southern boundary than the existing extension and it is not considered that it will cause any loss of amenity to those occupiers.

To the north, the extension will be partly screened from the neighbouring building by a fence and boundary vegetation. It is not considered that it will cause a loss of light or outlook for those occupiers. Three windows are shown on the north side elevation but these are at ground floor and it is not considered that they need to be obscure glazed due to existing boundary treatment acting as a screen. To the south, the proposed windows can also be clear glazed as they will face a blank wall and an obscured decorative window at the adjoining property.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. A minimum of 14 days notice of the commencement date of development shall be given in writing to the Local Planning Authority and the developer shall afford access at all times to an archaeological organisation/archaeologists nominated by the Local Planning Authority and shall allow them to observe the excavations and record archaeological evidence that may be uncovered as a result of the development.

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

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.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 21 November 2016

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 22 November 2016