Expiry Date - 09/03/2011

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0014/11 **Recommendation – Permit Application**

Site: **8 Bristol Avenue Lancing West Sussex BN15 8NJ**

Proposal: **Single-storey flat-roofed rear extension**

The Application

The application site is the northern half of a pair of semi-detached bungalows located on the eastern side of the road, within the built up area of Lancing.

The original pair of bungalows had stepped rear elevations, with there being (along with the attached neighbour No.6) a deep recess adjacent to the boundary. This has been in-filled by a flat roofed extension at the rear of the application property 5.5 to 2.7m in depth.

The proposals are to add to the existing extension a further flat-roofed extension that would be 5.6m in width, by 2.7m in depth. The height of the existing rear extension would be increased to match that of the proposed, a total of 2.7m.

The attached bungalow to the south (No.6) has also been extended with a rear flat-roofed extension that has in-filled the gap to the boundary. It extends to the rear by 5.6m, adjacent to the boundary. To the north No.10 has extended in a similar fashion, 4.8m in depth.

Consultations and Representations

Lancing Parish Council: No objections.

Third Parties: There has 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)
PPS 25 ‘Development and Flood Risk’ (CLG 2006)

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 entitled 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' states that the most important basic principle is that any extension should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and the street scene generally. Rear extensions which are within 1m of a common side boundary with an attached dwelling should be no deeper than 3.5m.

Visual amenity
The surrounding area is characterised by 1950's hipped roof semi-detached bungalows, many of which have been extended both to the front and rear with unsympathetic flat-roofed extensions. The proposed extension would attach to the rear of the existing, increasing the height by 0.4m. It would still be screened by the hip roof of the bungalow and would not be visible from the street. It would therefore have very limited impact on the character of the streetscene. The materials proposed would match those of the existing bungalow and extension.

Residential amenity
The proposals would result in a large extension that would project from the rear of the bungalow by 5.5m on the north – 8.1m in depth on the south. Whilst this is contrary to the standards as described above, there would be no harm in terms of loss of outlook, light or an overbearing effect, due to the neighbours either side having their own large extensions.

At the rear of the garden is a double garage served by the access road to the east, the remaining garden would be 52.5sqm (7.5m long by 7m wide), as opposed to the existing 63sqm. The reduction in garden area does have a bearing on the exterior amenity of the dwelling, It does not have an impact on the privacy of the properties to the rear which would still be 45m away.

There is a concern that approving such a large extension may set a poor precedent, however it is thought that considering the impact on residential amenity and visual amenity is limited that, on balance, the harm would not be so bad as to warrant refusal in this case.

Flood Risk
The site sits within Flood Zone 2 as identified to the Council by the Environment Agency, where the cumulative effect of minor extensions may have a significant effect on flood risk as highlighted in PPS25. The applicant's agent has indicated that the proposed extension would fully comply with the Environment Agency's Standing Advice on householder applications. Floor levels within the proposed extension are shown to be no lower than existing levels, and, flood proofing will be incorporated where appropriate.

Expiry Date - 09/03/2011

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPi

1. C1Ci
2. C12Eii
3. C18Eii (North or South)
4. C1Ei – amended
   ….in accordance with the following approved plans:-
   Drawing No: JW/11/001
   Title: Rear Extension
   Date Received: 12 Jan 2011

   And

   Flood Risk Assessment:
   Date Received: 18 Feb 2011

   Reason: For the …etc

Case Officer Carlos Hone Date