Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/1587/19** **Recommendation: APPROVE**

Site: **3 Orient Road, Lancing**

Proposal: **Proposed single-storey rear extension; front entrance porch with adjoining covered way**

Date of Site Visit: 13 November

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional neighbour notification: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings:

This application seeks full permission for the erection of a 3.5 metres deep single storey extension which would be 3 metres in height and extend to both adjoining boundaries. An existing conservatory/lean to, of substandard quality, of just over 2 metres in depth would be removed. The application has been amended during its determination, with permission originally sought for a 4.5 metre deep extension.

Permission is also sought for a front porch with adjoining covered way. The enclosed part of the porch would measure 2.7 x 1.3 metres with the covered area extending along the rest of the front of the property supported by a single oak post in the south eastern corner.

The application site is the mid property of a group of 3 to the northern side of Orient Road, close to its junction with The Broadway and West Way. The adjoining property to the west, number 1, has an existing extension and a number of outbuildings close to the mutual boundary. The property to the east, number 5, has a conservatory about 4 metres deep on its eastern side, but there is a recessed gap on the mutual boundary with a kitchen window in the back wall of the original property being located alongside the mutual boundary.

Planning History:

AWDM/1187/19: Householder application for permitted development for prior approval for single-storey extension to rear of property measuring 6m from rear wall of the original house, maximum height 3.65m and height of eaves of the extension 3m - application refused in September

Consultations:

Lancing Parish Council: no objection

Representations:

Original plans:

1 letter of objection received from 5 Orient Road on the grounds that the previous 6 metre extension was refused on the grounds of having an overbearing and enclosing impact and it is not considered that the reduction in the depth of the extension to 4.5 metres will overcome those concerns. An objection is also raised to the height and size of the porch on the grounds that it is not in character with the existing building and may prevent parking on the driveway to the front of the subject property.

5 letters of support from 14 The Broadway (to the north west of the application site), 2 Orient Road, 4 Orient Road, 6 Orient Road (opposite the application site) and 1 Orient Road (immediately adjoining neighbour to the west).

Amended plans:

No further comments received

Relevant Planning Policies:

Adur Local Plan (2017):

Policy 15: Quality of the Built Environment and Public Realm

Development Management Standard 2 – Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings

National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2019)

Planning Practice Guidance (CLG 2014)

Planning Assessment

The main issues in the determination of the application are the effect of the proposal upon the character of the area and the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Dealing with the porch firstly, it is not considered that the proposal will have any adverse impact upon the character of the area or neighbouring properties. Although a number of the properties in the area are set out as groups, such as this property and its adjoining neighbours either side, any symmetry has been lost by incremental additions, particularly to number 1 in this instance, and therefore there will not be a loss of any inherent character as a result of the proposal. A similar addition has been added to a property in West Way, also a middle property of a group of 3, seemingly without detriment and there is no reason to suppose that would not be the case here. The concern regarding parking on the driveway appears unfounded since its position on the bend of the road appears to give it a length equivalent of over a car and a half.

It is noted that 5 letters of support have been submitted, but 3 are from properties that are opposite the porch while the property in the Broadway is sufficiently distant for there to be no impact from the rear extension upon it. The rear extension only

affects the 2 properties either side, numbers 1 and 5 who have supported and objected to the application respectively.

Since the extension will be across the width of the property, the effect on both adjoining properties needs to be addressed. In terms of number 1, whose occupiers support the proposal, the property already has an extension of similar depth to the existing extension at the subject property but also has a shed placed alongside the eastern boundary. This appears to extend more deeply into the garden than the proposed extension and while a shed could be removed far more easily than an extension, its presence nonetheless means that if it were retained the proposed extension to number 3 would not have any adverse impact upon this property.

The situation in respect of number 5, though, is different and it is the effect upon this property that is the key issue in the determination of the application.

Although number 5 has a 4 metre deep conservatory, it is located on the eastern side of the property, about 1.5 metres away from the mutual boundary with the subject property. As a result, there is a kitchen window in the original rear wall of number 5 which is located between the conservatory and the mutual boundary. The proposed extension would be located very close to this window, therefore, and accordingly the previous application for a 6 metre deep extension was refused for the following reason:

The excessive depth of the proposed extension in proximity to the west side boundary of no. 5 Orient Road, would have an enclosing and overbearing impact resulting in an unacceptable loss of outlook and reduction in the light to the rear room and conservatory of no. 5. The proposal is therefore contrary to the Adur Local Plan policy 15; the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance DM Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'; and the NPPF

The applicant originally contended that the reduction in depth of 1.5 metres to 4.5 metres would overcome this objection.

Reference was made in the previous refusal reason to Development Management Standard No. 2 which is the relevant supplementary planning guidance for the application. The guidance states:

The closer a rear extension is to the boundary of a neighbouring property the more likely it is to adversely affect that property, by way of overlooking or loss of daylight. On semi-detached or terraced dwellings single-storey rear extensions which abut, or are within 1m of a common side boundary with an attached dwelling, should normally be no deeper than 3.5m.

As a matter of fact, therefore, the application as originally submitted exceeded this guidance by 1 metre and was still considered to have an unacceptable impact upon the neighbouring property.

Following further discussion, the application was amended to reduce the depth of the extension to 3.5 metres in accordance with the guidance and is now therefore considered acceptable.

Recommendation

To GRANT permission subject to the following conditions:

01 Approved Plans
02 Full Permission
03 Matching Materials
04 No windows east and side elevations

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? Y (to original plans) N (to amended plans)

Case Officer: [redacted] Date: 18/12/2019

Authorised by: [redacted] Date: 18/12/2019.