expiry 19.03.08

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0040/08 Recommendation - Permit

Site: 59 Lynchmere Avenue Lancing West Sussex BN15 0PB

Proposal: Single-storey rear extension

The Application

The application property is the northern half of a pair of semi-detached, hipped-roof bungalows located on the west side of Lynchmere Avenue, within the built-up area of Lancing. The properties on the western side of the road back onto Upper Boundstone Lane, which serves as access to Lancing and Sompting Cemetery.

The application property and its attached neighbour both have been extended previously. The pair both have a small flat roof rear extension 1m in depth which meets at the boundary. On the northern side the application property has a small conservatory accessed from the kitchen 1.8m in depth. The attached neighbour has a rear conservatory on the south side of the combined extension which projects approximately 3m. It has clear glazing in the northern elevation. The two properties are separated by a boundary fence 1.4m in height.

The proposal is for a flat-roofed rear extension 3.8m in width, by 3.0m in depth and 2.5m in height. It would be attached to existing 1m deep rear extension.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: There have been no third party objections to the proposals.

Lancing Parish Council: No comments received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (WSCC 2005): LOC1, DEV1, DEV4-5.
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7, and Appendix II ' Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

Planning Assessment

Policies
Structure Plan policies seek to protect, and where possible, enhance the character and distinctiveness of an area, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). 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.

Visual amenity
Visually the proposals are modest in scale and would not over dominate the existing bungalow. The height of the proposal matches exactly the existing small rear extension and the fascias would be at the same height. The proposals could be seen from the access road to the rear, but they would be partially screened by a flat roofed garage. The proposals would be in keeping with other buildings and extensions within the vicinity and is therefore acceptable in design.

Residential amenity
The proposed extension would be 3m in length and within 1m of the boundary with the attached property (no.57). This is within the maximum size as set out in the above Development Control Standard and it therefore is considered that the extension would not be overbearing or have an adverse effect on outlook from the attached property.

The Development Control Standard states that it is not usually acceptable to leave rooms in a deep recess between an existing extension of an attached property and a proposed extension which is adjacent to the boundary. In this instance the proposed extension, as stated above, would not be so big as to be overbearing or unneighbourly and the only consideration would therefore be the amount of light available. The attached property is located to the south of proposed extension and in this case the proposals would not have an affect on the amount of sunlight available to the room left in the recess.

A high wall screens the proposed small window in the northern side of the extension from the neighbouring property, preventing loss of privacy.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :- 1PPii

1. C1Ci
2. C12Eii
3. C18Eiv – south

Case Officer: [illegible]
Date: 03·03·08

PB 3/3/08