Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/1780/15**

Recommendation – Approve

Site: 5 Firle Road, Lancing

Proposal: Remove lower level timber extension on east side and replace with new brick built extension to create new basement room with new external steps

Date of site visit: 26-01-2016

Neighbours checked: Y
Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site relates to a detached dwellinghouse building in an outer residential suburb of Lancing. The site level drops significantly north-south; the building appears as a chalet bungalow when seen from the street, but is two-storey at the rear. The building has also been sizeably extended at the front with a pitched and gabled roof.

The proposal is for a shallowed pitched roof side extension to measure at 3.2 max metres in height, 7.1 metres in length, and 2.5 metres in width.

Relevant site history
AWDM/1253/15 - Rebuild rear side extension with pitched roof; side extension at front adding gable to hipped roof
Refused 01/10/2015

This application was refused for two reasons – the harmful visual impact of the forward-most side extension and the harm to neighbour's living conditions from the scale and proximity of the facing flank elevations of both extensions.

Consultations (summarised)
Lancing Parish Council: *No objection*

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies
National Planning Policy Framework
Saved Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 Extension and Alterations to dwellings

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Residential amenity

The neighbours principally impacted upon are those to the side and rear of the application site.

Neighbour to east, No. 3

The neighbour to the east is a bungalow set at a considerably lower height than the application property.

The previous proposal involved two extensions with high level flanking walls and roofs, which would have caused overbearing onto the neighbour, as well as loss of daylight and sunlight.

In this amended scheme the forward-most extension has been omitted and the remaining extension reduced to a flat roof. This has reduced the potential for adverse overbearing and overshadowing.

This is a considerable improvement on the relationship between the extension and the neighbouring building. Although some loss of light and outlook would occur, the harmful sense of overpowering encroachment from the previous scheme would not occur.

There are no windows/openings in the extension flank, so intrusive overlooking and loss of privacy would be negated.

Neighbour at rear

Although there will be some greater propensity for overlooking, this would not be of an unacceptable nature. The proposed works are physically removed from this neighbour so negate adverse overbearing/overshadowing.

For all the reasons above, no adverse harm would arise onto the living conditions of neighbours – the proposal has satisfied the criteria tests of the relevant local plan policies.

Visual amenity

The host building has been extended in the past, most prominently by way of a single-storey pitched roof front extension. However, the original dwelling building is still recognisable from street views.

The most contentious element of the previous proposal has been omitted.

Due to the drop in ground levels, the revised side extension would be hardly visible from the street; the top of it would sit at the mid-section of the building. It is of a sympathetic scale and design with rest of the host dwelling. It would be built of matching exterior materials and finishes.

For these reasons, the amended proposal would not be harmful to the visual appearance and character of the street scene – the proposal has satisfied the criteria tests of the relevant local plan policies.

Recommendation

Approve

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved Plans
3. Exterior materials/finishes to match
4. No windows/openings in side elevation

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 letter(s) of representation? N/a

Case Officer: Matthew Porter Date: 27-1-2016

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 27 January 2016