Expiry Date – 2/10, EOT agreed to 15/11

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1224/19 Recommendation – Grant

Site: 55 Fircroft Avenue, Lancing

Proposal: Proposed two storey and part single storey rear extension with raised steps

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: No, 14 day re-consultation undertaken.

Date of Site Visit: 15/10

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a mid terraced two storey house on the south side of Fircroft Avenue. The property has not been extended. Internal floor level at the rear is up 4 steps, common to other houses in this terrace.

No. 57, to the west, has a modest single storey rear extension. No. 53, to the east has a part single, part two storey rear extension with the first floor away from the shared boundary with the application site. Between 55 and 57 at ground floor level only is a common passageway.

The property is not in a conservation area and is not listed.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought to add a part single part two storey rear extension. The application has been revised since first submitted to reduce the width of the first floor addition and to hip the roof back.

Relevant Planning History

None.

Consultations

None undertaken.

Representations

None received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2019
Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and 15 including 'Development Management Standard No. 2 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development can be supported as it upgrades a dwelling within the built up area boundary. For consideration is the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area and the impacts of the development on neighbour amenity.

Character

No. 53 has a part single and part two storey rear extension. No. 51 has a two storey rear extension. It could not be argued that the proposal would be out of character.

Neighbour amenity

Adopted Development Management Standard No. 2 in relation to rear extensions states:

> ***Rear extensions***
> *3.2 The closer a rear extension is to the boundary of a neighbouring property the more likely it is to adversely affect that property, by way of overlooking or loss of daylight. On semi-detached or terraced dwellings single-storey rear extensions which abut, or are within 1m of a common side boundary with an attached dwelling, should normally be no deeper than 3.5m. Whilst two-storey (or first floor) rear extensions that are within 1m of a side boundary with an attached dwelling should normally be no deeper that 2m, extensions abutting the boundary will not normally be permitted.*

This revised proposal has pulled the first floor extension off the boundary with No. 57 by 1.5 metres. At 3 metres deep it is deeper than typically allowed by DM Std 2 but the extra 0.5 metre away from the boundary compensates for this. No. 57 has a bedroom window nearest the boundary at first floor. It is due west of the development.

The revision is also 1.3 metres off the common boundary with No. 53. No. 53 has a bathroom window closest. Light and outlook to bathrooms is less important than to a habitable room but nonetheless it is considered that adequate light will continue to be reached to 53's bathroom. Hipping back the proposed roof will also help.

The ground floor extension is 4 metres deep. No. 57 has a 1.5 metre deep ground floor rear extension. No. 53 has a similar depth rear extension to that proposed. High level west facing windows in No. 57's extension will be affected but these are secondary windows with windows and patio doors in their rear wall also.

It is considered that the revised proposal will not cause significant harm to neighbours in terms of light, outlook or overbearing impact.

Recommendation APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved Plans
2. 3 years
3. Materials to Match
4. No side windows

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, 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? No.

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 12.11.19
Authorised and signed by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 12 November 2019