Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – Approve**
AWDM/1363/12

Site: **13 Penhill Road. Lancing**

Proposal: **Single storey side extension to extend a kitchen**

Date of site visit: 8 January 2013

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings
The application relates to a two storey end of terrace house located on the north side of Penhill Road and is part of a terrace of 7 houses with front bay windows and forecourt gardens, all of which have been given over to car parking. The area is predominantly residential but there is a small commercial parade to the east of the terrace and some other commercial uses to the south and west and with a builders merchants at the rear of the site.

Permission is sought for a single storey lean-to extension to infill between the main rear wall and the side wall of the existing two storey rear projection. The extension would measure 3.6 metres in depth and 1.8 metres in width approximately and would not extend beyond the main side wall of the house and would align with the rear wall of the rear projection. The extension would measure approximately 3.5 metres in height. A rooflight window is proposed in the side roofslope.

Matching materials are proposed.

Relevant site history
None relevant

Consultations

Adur & Worthing Councils: *the Environmental Heath Officer has recommended a full contamination condition.*

Lancing Parish Council: No objection

Representations
None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted 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’

South East Plan (GOSE 2009): CC1, CC6, BE1
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Visual amenity
Although the extension may be partially visible from the street when looking down the access to the side of No.9, it would be set towards the rear of the house and as such would not be readily visible in the streetscene. The scale and design would be in keeping and the use of matching materials would help the extension to blend in with the existing building.

Residential amenity
The spacing between No. 13 and No.9 is such that, given the limited scale of the proposals, there would be no significant overbearing impact or other loss of amenity to the occupiers of No.9, and buildings at 9a to the rear are set further back in the site and relate to the builders merchants and would not suffer any loss of amenity. The side rooflight window is at a high level and would not cause any significant loss of privacy. It is recommended that a condition to prevent any further side windows would ensure no future loss of privacy.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) or the policies of the South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1)

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Full contamination condition
3. Materials to match existing dwelling etc
4. No windows or other openings in west side wall of the extension
5. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Drawing No: 1727.P1 entitled 'Site Location & Block Plan with existing and proposed Elevations' deposited 13 November 2012
   Drawing No: 1727.P2 entitled 'Existing and proposed Floor Plans' deposited 13 November 2012

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

Case Officer: Rebekah Smith Date: 8 January 2013

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 8 January 2013