Expiry Date -

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/1327/12

Site: **26 North Farm Road Lancing**

Proposal: **Single-storey rear extension with roof lantern**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: /N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a single storey rear extension to measure (at max) approx. 3.7 metres in height, 5.4 metres in length, 5.3 metres in width

The application property is a semi-detached two-storey dwellinghouse with pebble dash exterior walls. It has been extended in the past by way of single storey flat roof rear extension.

Relevant Planning History

None

Consultations

Worthing & Adur Councils: The **Environmental Health** officer requests precautionary contamination condition

Lancing Parish Council: No objection

Representations

None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

South East Plan (GOSE 2009): BE1, CC1, CC6
Saved Adur Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle

Visual amenity

The extension is rudimentary in its design but it is not visible from public vantage point. Its scale is also sympathetic and the fenestration is in proportion and of a suitable style to the rest of the building. The extension will be finished in matching exterior finishes. It will be 5.4m deep which exceeds the Council's DC Standard but is considered to be acceptable in this case due to the presence of the neighbouring property's extension of the same depth.

No visual harm would arise from it.

Residential amenity – effect on existing dwellings

It is the adjoining neighbour who is principally affected by this development (it is removed from the remainder).

The footprint of the extension is large but the proposed extension would protrude no further into the back garden than the neighbour's own extension. This means adverse overbearing and overshadowing effect is avoided.

Because the neighbour's own extension blocks views of the extension, any overlooking would be oblique and largely screened by garden boundary fencing. Loss of privacy would not therefore be unacceptable.

Sufficient distance is retained between the extension and the neighbouring building to the east so as to avoid harmful overbearing and overshadowing effect, and with no windows in the flank intrusive overlooking is negated.

No harm to neighbour's living conditions would arise from this development.

Contaminated Land

The site is not contaminated so an informative would suffice to raise the applicant's awareness of this risk

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development can take place without detriment to the local environment and would not detract from the character or appearance of the area. It would not result in any detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and consequently does not conflict with saved Adur Local Plan policies AG1, AH7 and the South East Plan policies BE1, CC1, CC6

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans

3. Materials and finishes to match
4. No windows/openings to east elevation

Informatives

If during development, any visible contaminated or odorous material, (for example asbestos containing material, stained soil, petrol/diesel/solvent odour, underground tanks or associated pipework) not previously identified, is found to be present at the site, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until it has been investigated by the developer. The Local Planning Authority must be informed immediately of the nature and degree of the contamination present and a method statement detailing how the unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with must be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing before being implemented

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 any representations? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 29-11-2012

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 6 December 2012