Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0552/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 12 Hamilton Road, Lancing, West Sussex BN15 9NP

Proposal: Demolition of existing conservatory and construction of single storey side and rear extension.

Date of site visit: 19.05.2016

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a semi-detached bungalow with side garage to boundary with no. 14. At the front there is existing vehicular access and hardsurfacing for parking. To the rear there is an attached conservatory and there are free standing summer houses and sheds at the rear boundary.

No. 14 has a rear conservatory extension up to the boundary with the application site, and where the proposed extension will be positioned. It too has a garage to the boundary, which is in line with the one on the application site.

The street scene comprises semi-detached bungalows.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought to provide a full width single storey rear extension which will also wrap around the side of the property also, and abut the rear of the existing garage and the side boundary.

The depth of the extension at the rear will be some 3.55m and will have a height of approx. 2.8m. The side extension will have the same height, and be approx. 6.8m long x 2.45m wide.

The extension will be rendered finish to match the existing bungalow.

Consultations:

Southern Water: A formal application for any new connection to the public foul sewer to be made by the applicant or developer. Request an informative if the application is approved.

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Relevant Planning History

ADC/0247/10 Single storey rear and side extensions Approved Conditionally 06/08/2010

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extension which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The proposed extension would fill the full width of the existing plot, running across the back of the house and up to the side boundary with no. 14. No. 14 has a conservatory extension up to the boundary with no. 12, with windows directly facing over no. 12, which is quite unneighbourly. However, the applicant informed me that the neighbour was a family member and would do a similar extension to the one proposed by the applicant.

The proposal is a resubmission of an earlier approved application for a rear full width extension together with side extension up to the boundary with no. 14 (although the side extension dog legged back from the end of the rear extension. Reading the notes, it too would abut the neighbouring conservatory.

The extension will be only some 50mm longer than the 3.5m required within Development Control Standard No. 3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.', the 50mm is considered to be acceptable in this instance.

Residential Amenity

Further investigation on the matter of the previous planning history, has revealed that there was a similar application for the extension as shown within this current application, in 2010 (ADC/0247/10 refers). The side conservatory was noted within the application, where it was drawn to the case officer's information that the neighbour was a family member who was going to construct an extension up to the boundary with no. 12. To date, neither the neighbours' extension nor the applicants' extension has taken place.

Normal practice would not be to approve an infilling of the section between the dwelling and the boundary, however, in view of the fact that a family member lives next door and not only is aware of the proposed extension but also intends to construct a very similar one themselves. Similarly, an earlier approval for a very similar extension was approved in 2010. It is considered that in this instance, the proposal is acceptable in these circumstances.

The extension is located wholly at the rear and would have no impact on the street-scene

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. Approved plans
2. Standard time limit
3. Materials to match existing
4. No windows in sides

Informative:

1. Standard informative – approved without amendments
2. SW informative sewer connection
3. SW informative sewer may be on site

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

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 24.05.2016

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 25.05.2016