Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1284/18 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 37 Monks Close, Lancing, West Sussex

Proposal: Single storey rear and side extension to south and south west elevations.

Date of site visit: 22nd October 2018

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is an end of terrace, two storey property at the end of a cul de sac in Lancing. The plot is narrow to the front widening to the rear with a long rear garden toward the railway line to the rear. The front door of the property has been moved to the side and there is off street parking to the property frontage.

Consent was originally sought for a side and rear wrap around extension, flat roof in design to match in materials that of the existing building. The depth of this proposal was 7 metres to the rear and 2.8 metres wide to the side.

Officers advised that in this case a rear extension to such a depth where there is an attached dwelling would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling. The extension would be overly large resulting in a loss of light and an overbearing, unneighbourly impact.

Amended plans have been received showing a reduction in depth of the extension to 3.5 metres. The extension is set in from the boundary of the attached property by 1 metre. To the side the extension is 2.8 metres wide, set back from the front of the property by 4.1 metres, it is 3.3 metres high. The extension will provide an open plan kitchen dining/living room space, with storage and utility room to the side. Glazed doors to the rear lead to decking which steps down to the rear garden.

Representations

1 Email representations received in relation to the original proposal: -

The proposal is excessively large, almost doubling the footprint of the end of terrace house.
There are some errors on the plans which need correcting.
The erection of this rear extension would significantly reduce our natural light levels through our patio doors into our dining room and our garden patio.

1 Email representation received in relation to the amended proposal: -

Objecting to the amended submitted plans. The front door is shown incorrectly. Although the extension has been reduced the plan still shows the extension going too near to the boundary line. It should be a minimum of 3 metres away.
No trees are shown, the foundations of the proposed extension could impact upon the foundations of our property.
Using the 45 degree rule the amended proposals would still impact upon natural daylight. We have a Right to Light 2017 as we have enjoyed natural light uninterrupted and without permission for over 20 years.

Lancing Parish Council: - A resident of the neighbouring property outlined her reasons for objection, however the committee agreed that the reasons stated were not material planning grounds to be considered when determining a response to planning applications and therefore could not support the objection.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (July 2018)

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 rear addition will not be visible within the street scene, the side extension although visible from the front of the property is well set back and the boundary line screens this further. The flat roof design keeps the height of the extension to a minimum. It is considered that the design is acceptable in this case, materials will be used to match existing in this case. The extension as reduced is in keeping in scale and size with the main dwelling. It is not overly dominant.

Residential amenity

The rear addition as originally submitted was considered to be overly large and detrimental to the amenities of the adjacent, attached dwelling. As reduced it is considered that the extension, although visible from the neighbouring property is reduced to a degree that can be supported here. The extension is to be set off the boundary by 1 metre and will extend by 3.5 metres. Development Management Standards state that in cases such as this an extension could be built up to the boundary with an attached dwelling up to 3.5 metres in depth. In this case the neighbouring property has a rear projection leaving patio doors in a recess between this and the proposed new addition. It is considered that due to the set in of 1 metre

and the angled boundary, which allows the extension to be angled away from the rear patio doors, that the impact would be reduced. It is therefore considered that the extension as amended would not result in any significant adverse impact which would warrant a refusal in this case. A condition is attached to ensure that there are no openings on the side elevation with the attached neighbour. There is raised decking to the rear of the extension. This is not considered to have any adverse impact in this case. It is not overly elevated or large in footprint and it is set in away from the boundary.

The neighbour to the south is at a right angle to the application site. There is spacing between these properties which means there will be little impact in this case with regards to loss of light or overbearing impact. Due to the proximity to the boundary a condition is attached to limit overlooking and loss of privacy.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials to match existing
4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 as amended (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows or other openings shall be formed in the north side wall of the extension.
5. The windows and doors on the southern elevation shall be fitted with obscure glazing only, with the exception of the high level dining/living room window which can be clearly glazed provided that it is a minimum of 1.7 metres above finished floor level. There shall be no additional opening on the southern elevation without prior written consent from the Local Planning Authority.

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

1. Proactive with amendments
2. Party wall Act

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 18th December 2018

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 20 December 2018