Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1608/18 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 88 West Way, Lancing, BN15 8NB

Proposal: Retention of single storey side extension to east elevation (part retrospective)

Date of site visit: 23.11.2018

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is positioned on the north side of West Way and is a semi-detached bungalow, with a narrowing rear garden. Its neighbour, no. 86 West Way, is on a corner junction and is thereby sited forward and at an angle to the application site. No. 86 also has a side extension next to the application site. The street scene comprises predominantly semi-detached bungalows.

Works for the proposal, the subject of this application, have already started, and is clearly seen that it is located close to the extension of no. 86.

The proposal (as amended) seeks permission for a side extension, with a false pitched roof, measuring 3.3m wide at its frontage and 4.8m deep before the kick back section, (because of the narrowing rear garden, the extension will kick back at its rear section). The extension will provide a new bedroom and an entrance porch.

Representations:

Lancing Parish Council: No objections

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 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 proposed extension is to the front side of the bungalow and sits very close to the neighbouring property, no. 86, which itself is set forward of the application site and because of it being a corner site, it is positioned at angle.

Google maps reveal that originally, there was a garage relating to no. 88 in the position now occupied by the proposal, and it too was positioned very close to the side boundary with no. 86. Further the garage was sited forward of the host dwelling by approx. 900mm., and the neighbouring extension was some 600mm forward of the former garage, thereby creating a stepping back of built form at this position.

The proposed application sits forward of the main wall of the host dwelling by 804mm; behind the line of the original garage by 220mm; and behind the neighbouring extension at no. 86 by 870mm. Thereby, although the extension abuts the host dwelling where the former garage did not, its positioning is comparable to that of the former garage.

It is considered that the closure of the gap from the former garage to the host dwelling, will not result in unacceptable visual harm onto the character of the area, particularly because the gap was not readily seen outside of the site.

The other difference between the former garage to the current proposal, is its height. The low pitched roof of the garage came to a little over the height of the eaves of no.86's extension, whilst the height of the proposal is not dissimilar to the height of the neighbouring extension, and the eaves of the proposal runs in line with the host dwelling.

Overall, while it does project forward of the main front wall, it is set back behind the line of the adjoining extension and, on balance, it is considered that the design of the extension as amended, does not result in sufficient harm to the street scene to warrant refusal.

Residential amenity

The neighbouring property no. 86 would be the most affected by the proposal, but a visit to that property and viewing from their rear garden reveals that the proposal is set at a position that will not affect their residential living conditions by way of overshadowing; overlooking; or overbearing.

From the front the extension is very visible, but it does not materially affect the existing residential properties on the opposite side of the street.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Materials to match existing
3. No windows in side elevation facing onto no. 86

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

Informative:-

1. Approved with amendments

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 10.01.2019

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 10 January 2019